Supplement to the English translation of The Essential Adi Shankara

ಶಾಂಕರವೇದಾಂತಸಾರ

by Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Mahaswami,
translated by D.B. Gangolli
(Unofficial Version)

Compiled and edited by Thomas Felber, July 2022

Dedicated to Adi Shankaracharya Bhagavatpada

Abbreviations

Ait.Up.	Aitareya Upaniṣad
BG. (smriti)	Bhagavad Gītā
Bh.	Bhāṣyam
BGh.	Bhagavad Gītā Bhāṣyam
BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya	Adhyāsa Bhāṣya
BSBh.	Brahma-Sūtra Bhāṣyam
Br.Up.	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Ch.Up.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
Isa. (Is.Up.)	Īśopaniṣad
Kath.Up.	Kaṭhopaniṣad
Kena.Up.	Kenopaniṣad
Ma.Up.	Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad
Ma.Up.Ka.	Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad Kārikā
Mund.Up.	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
Pra.Up.	Praśnopaniṣad
(smriti)	smṛti without Bhāṣyam
(sruti)	śruti without Bhāṣyam
Tai.Up.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Up.	Upaniṣad
Upod.	Introduction (Upōdghāta)
UPS Prose	Upadeśasāhasri (Gadyabandha)
UPS Metrical	Upadeśasāhasri (Padyabandha)

No references concerning Sections 1-9

Section 10

References:

नैष दोषः, अविद्यादिसंसारहेतुविशरणादेः सदिधात्वर्थस्य ग्रन्थमात्रेऽसम्भवाद्विद्यायां च सम्भवात् ग्रन्थस्यापि तादर्थ्येन तच्छब्दत्वोपपत्तेः 'आयुर्वै घृतम्ऽ (तै. सं. २ . ३ . ११) इत्यादिवत्
Kath.Up. Upod. Bh.

"Though, from this point of view, the meanings of the root sad such as loosening, the causes of the world, viz ignorance etc. are inapplicable with regard to a mere book, and applicable to knowledge, still this is no fault, since the book, too, being meant for that purpose, can justifiably be denoted by that word, as for instance (in the sentence) 'Clarifed butter is indeed life."

य इमां ब्रह्मविद्यामुपयन्त्यात्मभावेन श्रद्धाभक्तिपुरःसराः सन्तः, तेषां गर्भजन्मजरारोगाद्यनर्थपूगं निशातयति परं वा ब्रह्म गमयत्यविद्यादिसंसारकारणं वा अत्यन्तमवसादयति विनाशयतीत्युपनिषत् ; उपनिपूर्वस्य सदेरेवमर्थस्मरणात्
Mund.Up. Upod. Bh.

"That which removes the entire evils such as the stay (in the womb) as foetus, birth, old age and illness, of those Who approach the knowledge of Brahman with faith (trust) and devotion, is called Upanishad or it is called so

because it leads to the supreme Brahman or because it destroys totally the ignorance which is the cause of samsara, for such is the meaning ascribed to the root ∗sad preceded by the prefixes ∗upa and ∗ni."

Section 11

References:

तत्र प्रयोजनवत्साधनाभिव्यञ्जकत्वेनाभिधेयसम्बद्धं शास्त्रं पारम्पर्येण विशिष्टसम्बन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनवद्भवति

Mand.Up. Upod Bh.

"This treatise must be said to contain a subject-matter on account of its revealing the means (for the realization of Ātman) that serves the purpose, or the end to be attained. It therefore possesses, though indirectly, 'specific relationship', 'subject-matter' and 'the end to be attained'."

किं पुनस्तत्प्रयोजनमिति, उच्यते

Mand.Up. Upod Bh.

What then, is that end in view? It is thus explained:

रोगार्तस्येव रोगनिवृत्तौ स्वस्थता, तथा दुःखात्मकस्यात्मनो द्वैतप्रपञ्चोपशमे स्वस्थता ; अद्वैतभावः प्रयोजनम्

Mand.Up. Upod Bh.

"As a man stricken with disease regains his normal state with the removal of (the cause of) the disease, so the

self labouring under misapprehension, owing to identification of itself with misery, recovers its normal state with the cessation (of the illusion) of duality, which manifests itself as the phenomenal universe. This realization of nonduality is the end to be attained."

द्वैतप्रपञ्चस्य चाविद्याकृतत्वाद्विद्यया तदुपशमः स्यादिति ब्रह्मविद्याप्रकाशनाय अस्यारम्भः क्रियते

Mand.Up. Upod Bh.

This treatise is begun for the purpose of revealing Brahman inasmuch as by knowledge (Vidyā) the illusion of duality, caused by ignorance, is destroyed.

आत्मा च ब्रह्म

Tai.Up. Upod. Bh.

The Self, indeed, is Brahman.

आत्मा च ब्रह्म

BSBh. 1.1.1

The Self, indeed, is Brahman.

Section 12

References:

नित्यान्यधिगतानि कर्माणि उपात्तदुरितक्षयार्थानि, काम्यानि च फलार्थिनां पूर्वस्मिन्ग्रन्थे . इदानीं कर्मोपादानहेतुपरिहाराय ब्रह्मविद्या प्रस्तूयते

Tai.Up. Upod. Bh.

In the preceding chapters (viz. Prapathakas 1 to 6 of the Taittiriya Aranyaka), the obligatory duties which are intended for eliminating the sins already incurred, and the rites prompted by desire, have been taught. Now, in order to get rid of the causes that are instrumental in the performance of karmas, the knowledge of Brahman is commenced (started).

सर्वथाप्यस्त्यात्मा देहान्तरसम्बन्धीत्येवं
प्रतिपत्तुर्देहान्तरगतेष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायविशेषार्थिनस्तद्विशेषज्ञापनाय कर्मकाण्डमारब्धम् . न त्वात्मनः
इष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारेच्छाकारणमात्मविषयमज्ञानं
कर्तृभोक्तृस्वरूपाभिमानलक्षणं
तद्विपरीतब्रह्मात्मस्वरूपविज्ञानेनापनीतम्

Br.Up. Upod. Bh.

In any case, a man who believes that there is a self which gets into relation with a future body, seeks to know the particular means of attaining the good and avoiding the evil in connection with that body. Hence the ceremonial portion of the Vedas is introduced to acquaint him with these details. But the cause of that desire to attain the good and avoid the evil, viz. ignorance regarding the Self, which expresses itself as the idea of one's being the agent and experiencer, has not been

removed by its opposite, the knowledge of the nature of the self as being identical with Brahman.

स एष बीजाङ्कुरादिवदविद्याकृतः संसारः आत्मनि
क्रियाकारकफलाध्यारोपलक्षणोऽनादिरनन्तोऽनर्थ
इत्येतस्माद्विरक्तस्याविद्यानिवृत्तये
तद्विपरीतब्रह्मविद्याप्रतिपत्त्यर्थोपनिषदारभ्यते

Br.Up. Upod. Bh.

That relative universe, without beginning and end like the seed and the sprout etc., created by ignorance and consisting in a superimposition of action, its factors, and its results on the Self, is an evil. Hence for the removal of the ignorance of a man who is disgusted with this universe, this Upaniṣad is being commenced in order to teach the knowledge of Brahman which is the very opposite of that ignorance.

Section 13

References:

संवर्तप्रभृतीनां च नग्नचर्यादियोगात् अनपेक्षिताश्रमकर्मणामपि .
महायोगित्वं स्मर्यत इतिहासे

BSBh. 3.4.36-37

That, Saṃvarta (a Smṛti-kāra) and others who did not care to perform the religious duties of an order of life,

and went about in the nude, became great Yogins in spite of that, is testified by history.

न शूद्रस्याधिकारः, वेदाध्ययनाभावात् । अधीतवेदो हि विदितवेदार्थो वेदार्थेष्वधिक्रियते । न च शूद्रस्य वेदाध्ययनमस्ति ; उपनयनपूर्वकत्वाद्वेदाध्ययनस्य, उपनयनस्य च वर्णत्रयविषयत्वात्

BSBh. 1.3.34

The Śūdra has no such competency, as the study of Vedas is absent (in his case). It is only one who has studied the Vedas and understood their meaning that has competency in Vedic matters. A Śūdra is precluded from the study of the Vedas. As Upanayana (initiation with the sacred thread) is a sine-qua-non for the study of Vedas, and as it is prescribed for the three Varṇas only (i.e. for Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya).

येषां पुनः पूर्वकृतसंस्कारवशाद्विदुरधर्मव्याधप्रभृतीनां ज्ञानोत्पत्तिः, तेषां न शक्यते फलप्राप्तिः प्रतिषेद्धुम् , ज्ञानस्यैकान्तिकफलत्वात् । 'श्रावयेच्चतुरो वर्णान्S इति चेतिहासपुराणाधिगमे चातुर्वर्ण्यस्याधिकारस्मरणात् । वेदपूर्वकस्तु नास्त्यधिकारः शूद्राणामिति स्थितम्

BSBh. 1.3.38

In the case of those such as Vidura, Dharma-Vyādha, etc., who happen to have acquired knowledge because of the Saṃskāras of the actions done in the previous births, It is not possible to prohibit them from acquiring the fruit of (their knowledge), because knowledge surely must

have its fruit. Smṛti, however, by the passage “He should let all the four castes hear” allows all the four castes to acquire the knowledge of Itihāsa and Purāṇa. So, the conclusion is, that the Śūdras have no competency for the Vedas (and therefore for Brahma-Vidyā).

Section 14

References:

स्वाध्यायानन्तर्यं तु समानम्
BSBh. 1.1.1
The coming after the study of the Veda, is common (to both).

तस्मात्किमपि वक्तव्यम्, यदनन्तरं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासोपदिश्यत इति. उच्यते – नित्यानित्यवस्तुविवेकः, इहामुत्रार्थभोगविरागः,
शमदमादिसाधनसम्पत्, मुमुक्षुत्वं च. तेषु हि सत्सु, प्रागपि
धर्मजिज्ञासाया ऊर्ध्वं च, शक्यते ब्रह्म जिज्ञासितुं ज्ञातुं च; न विपर्यये
BSBh. 1.1.1
Therefore, it is necessary to mention something, after which the inquiry into Brahman is advised. We reply – Discrimination between the eternal thing and a transitory thing, distaste for the enjoyment of things here in this world as well as in the world beyond, equipment of oneself with tranquillity, self-restraint, and such other similar means, and the desire for liberation. When these are present, it is possible to desire the knowledge of

Brahman and to realize it, even before the desire for the knowledge of duty or after it, just as you please.

ज्ञानमात्रे यद्यपि सर्वाश्रमिणामधिकारः, तथापि संन्यासनिष्ठैव ब्रह्मविद्या मोक्षसाधनं न कर्मसहितेति 'भैक्षचर्यां चरन्तःऽ (मु. उ. १ । २ । ११) 'संन्यासयोगात्ऽ (मु. उ. ३ । २ । ६) इति च ब्रुवन्दर्शयति
Mund.Up. Upod. Bh.

Though **men of all stages have a right to knowledge**, the knowledge of Brahman in conjunction with renunciation (Sannyasa) alone becomes a means for liberation, but not the knowledge in conjunction with karma. Thus (the Upanishad) reveals itself by uttering, 'Those who resort to living on alms' (Mundaka Up I.2.11) and 'By the yoga of renunciation' (Mundaka Up III.2.6).

Section 15

References:

तद्यथेह कर्मजितो लोकः क्षीयत एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यजितो लोकः क्षीयते

Chand.Up. 8.1.6 (sruti)
Just as here on earth, the world, which is earned by work perishes, even so there in the other world, the world which is earned by righteous deeds perishes…
तत् तत्र यथा इह लोके तासामेव स्वाम्यनुशासनानुवर्तिनीनां प्रजानां सेवादिजितो लोकः पराधीनोपभोगः क्षीयते अन्तवान्भवति

Chand.Up. 8.1.6 Bh.

Just as in this world, the enjoyment obtained for services etc. rendered by those subjects who obey the orders of their master, depends upon the mercy of another and comes to an end, so also, (does it occur) in the other world.

अथ इदानीं दार्ष्टान्तिकमुपसंहरति

एवमेव अमुत्र अग्निहोत्रादिपुण्यजितो लोकः पराधीनोपभोगः क्षीयत एवेति

Chand.Up. 8.1.6 Bh.

Now, by citing the above illustration, the subject is concluded. In the same way, the enjoyment gained in the other world through such righteous deeds as Agnihotra and the like, depends upon the mercy of external causes and comes to an end.

परीक्ष्य लोकान्कर्मचितान्ब्राह्मणो निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन ।
तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम् ॥

Mundaka.Up. 1.2.12 (sruti)

A Brahmana should resort to renunciation after examining the worlds acquired through karma, with the help of this maxim: ‘There is nothing (here) that is not the result of karma; so what is the need of (performing) karma?’ For knowing that Reality he should go, with sacrificial faggots

in hand, only to a teacher versed in the Vedas and absorbed in Brahman.

अथेदानीमस्मात्साध्यसाधनरूपात्सर्वस्मात्संसाराद्विरक्तस्य परस्यां विद्यायामधिकारप्रदर्शनार्थमिदमुच्यते

Mundaka.Up. 1.2.12 Bh.

Thereafter, this verse is now being stated in order to show that one who becomes detached from this whole world of ends and means has competence for the higher knowledge.

जानाम्यहं शेवधिः निधिः कर्मफललक्षणः निधिरिव प्रार्थ्यत इति . असौ अनित्यम् अनित्य इति जानामि . न हि यस्मात् अनित्यैः अध्रुवैः यत् नित्यं ध्रुवम् , तत् प्राप्यते परमात्माख्यः शेवधिः .
यस्त्वनित्यसुखात्मकः शेवधिः, स एवानित्यैर्द्रव्यैः प्राप्यते

Kath.Up. 1.2.10 Bh.

I know what is prayed for like a treasure, consisting of the fruits of karma, is impermanent for by means of things which are not constant, the treasure which is called the supreme Self and which is constant cannot be reached.

यस्मादेवं कष्टा संसारगतिः, तस्माज्जुगुप्सेत

यस्माच्च जन्ममरणजनितवेदनानुभवकृतक्षणाः क्षुद्रजन्तवो ध्वान्ते च घोरे दुस्तरे प्रवेशिताः – सागर इव अगाधेऽप्लवे निराशाश्चोत्तरणं प्रति,

तस्माच्चैवंविधां संसारगति जुगुप्सेत बीभत्सेत घृणी भवेत् – मा भूदेवंविधे संसारमहोदधौ घोरे पात इति

Chand.Up. 5.8.10 Bh.

Since this transmigratory course is thus painful, therefore it should be despised. And also because the little creatures, whose time is consumed in experiencing pain originating from birth and death, and which are shoved into terrible darkness as though into a bottomless sea without any raft, from where it is difficult to come out, are without hope of crossing it, for that reason also one should despise, be afraid of, be hateful of the course of transmigration, so that there may not be any falling into this kind of a terrible, vast sea of transmigration.

तस्मादेवंविच्छान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति सर्वमात्मानं पश्यति

Br.Up. 4.4.23 (sruti)

Therefore, he who knows it as such becomes selfcontrolled, calm, withdrawn into himself, enduring and concentrated, and sees the Self in his own self (body); he sees all as the Self…

Section 16

References:

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम सर्वसत्त्वसुखो हितः .
अविवादोऽविरुद्धश्च देशितस्तं नमाम्यहम्
Ma.Up.Ka. 4.2 (Karika)

I salute this Yoga known as the Asparśa (i.e., free from all touch which implies duality), taught through the scripture, – the Yoga which promotes the happiness of all beings and conduces to the wellbeing of all, and which is free from strife and contradictions.

Section 17

References:

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु स्वसिद्धान्तरचनानियमेषु कपिलकणादबुद्धार्हतादिदृष्ट्यनुसारिणो द्वैतिनो निश्चिताः, एवमेवैष परमार्थो नान्यथेति, तत्र तत्रानुरक्ताः प्रतिपक्षं चात्मनः पश्यन्तस्तं द्विषन्त इत्येवं रागद्वेषोपेताः स्वसिद्धान्तदर्शननिमित्तमेव परस्परम् अन्योन्यं विरुध्यन्ते . तैरन्योन्यविरोधिभिरस्मदीयोऽयं वैदिकः सर्वानन्यत्वादात्मैकत्वदर्शनपक्षो न विरुध्यते, यथा स्वहस्तपादादिभिः . एवं रागद्वेषादिदोषानास्पदत्वादात्मैकत्वबुद्धिरेव सम्यग्दर्शनमित्यभिप्रायः
Mand.Up.Ka.Bh. 3.17

The dualists who are the followers of the views of Kapila, Kanada, Buddha, Arhata and others are firmly established in the basic principles that lead to their own doctrine. "The supreme Truth can be this alone, and not anything else". Being thus attached to their own conclusion, they,

while seeing their opponents, fall out with them. Thus, they are possessed of attachment and repulsion, and with a view to safeguarding their conclusions they come into conflict with one another. Owing to the fact that all are non-different, this our view which is Vedic, and which consists in the perception (understanding) of the Self, does not get into conflict with them who mutually oppose even as one does not come into conflict with one's own hands, feet, etc. Thus, the idea of the unity of the Self alone, being free from evils such as attachment, repulsion etc. constitutes the right understanding. That is the meaning.

यदि च तेषां भ्रान्तानां द्वैतदृष्टिः अस्माकमद्वैतदृष्टिरभ्रान्तानाम् , तेनायं हेतुना अस्मत्पक्षो न विरुध्यते तैः, 'इन्द्रो मायाभिःऽ (बृ. उ. २ . ५ . १९) 'न तु तद्द्वितीयमस्तिऽ (बृ. उ. ४ . ३ . २३) इति श्रुतेः

Mand.Up.Ka.Bh. 3.18

Though these deluded men have a dualistic vision, and we, the undeluded have a non-dualistic vision, as supported by the srutis such as, "The Lord, due to Maya, appears as manifold" (Brih. Up. 2. 5.19), "(Then) there is not that second entity" (Br. Up. 4. 3.23), we do not, on account of that reason, become opposed to them.

Supplement:

ततः परमार्थतो ब्रह्मविदात्मैव द्वैतिनाम्

Mand.Up.Ka.Bh. 3.18

Thus, in Reality, the knower of Brahman is nothing but the Self of the dualists.

Section 18

References:

अथवा यथोक्तम् ऋग्वेदादिशास्त्रं योनिः कारणं प्रमाणमस्य ब्रह्मणो यथावत्स्वरूपाधिगमे. शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्माधिगम्यत इत्यभिप्रायः

BSBh. 1.1.3

Or (we may construe the Sūtra in this way) – the Śāstra, Ṛg-Veda etc. described above, is the source, the cause, and the authoritative means of the understanding of the right knowledge of Brahman as it is. What is meant to be conveyed is that Brahman which is the cause and origin etc. of this transitory world, is understood from the Śāstra (such as the Scriptures) which **is the only means of right knowledge.**

न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं
मुक्तिनिबन्धनमागममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम्

BSBh. 2.1.11

Barring traditional instruction of the Vedas, it is not possible even to indulge in any conjecture about the very deep nature and positive existence of an entity (Brahman) as such, on which Final Release depends.

Section 19

References:

न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्. किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम्,

अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य

BSBh. 1.1.2

It is not that the Scriptures alone are the means of the right knowledge of Brahman, as is the case about the right knowledge of religious duty, But the Scriptures, as also **intuitional experience, so far as is possible, constitute the authoritative or valid means** of right knowledge, Because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in the realization (Anubhava) of Brahman, and has an already existing entity as its object.

कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादावनुभवानारूढे स्यादाशङ्का भवेद्वा न वेति ; अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् – 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्मऽ (बृ. उ. ३ । ४ । १) इति श्रुतेः 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा. उ. ६ । ८ । ७) इति सिद्धवदुपदेशात्

BSBh. 3.3.32

The fruits of actions, however, viz. the heaven etc., not being based on experience, a doubt, as to whether they are or are not possible, would be justified. **But the fruit of perfect knowledge is based on experience.** Because the Scriptures (sruti) declare "That Brahman, which is immediate and is directly experienced" (Br.Up. 3.4.1), And give instruction about it, as being an entity firmly established, thus – "That thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7).

Section 20

References:

अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य

BSBh. 1.1.2

Because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in the realization (Anubhava) of Brahman and has an already existing entity as its object.

न तु वस्तु 'एवम्, नैवम्ऽ 'अस्ति, नास्तिऽ इति वा विकल्प्यते

BSBh. 1.1.2

But there is no such scope for exercising an option in the case of an existing entity, such as that it is like this or not like this or that it does not exist.

न हि श्रुतिशतमपि 'शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वाऽ इति ब्रुवत् प्रामाण्यमुपैति । यदि ब्रूयात् 'शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वाऽ इति, तथापि अर्थान्तरं श्रुतेः विवक्षितं कल्प्यम् , प्रामाण्यान्यथानुपपत्तेः, न तु प्रमाणान्तरविरुद्धं स्ववचनविरुद्धं वा

BGh. 18.66

A hundred srutis may declare that fire is cold or that it is dark; still they possess no authority in the matter. If sruti should at all declare that fire is cold or that it is dark, we would still suppose that it intends quite a different meaning from the apparent one; for, its authority cannot otherwise be maintained; we should in no way attach to sruti a meaning which is opposed to other authorities or to its own declaration.

Section 21

References:

एकरूपेण हयवस्थितो योऽर्थः स परमार्थः ; लोके तद्विषयं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानमित्युच्यते – यथाग्निरुष्ण इति ; तत्रैवं सति सम्यग्ज्ञाने पुरुषाणां विप्रतिपत्तिरनुपपन्ना

BSBh. 2.1.11

That entity which exists uniformly is the highest entity. In the ordinary world, knowledge about it is understood to be perfect knowledge, as for instance the knowledge that 'fire is hot'. It being so, it would not be reasonably sustainable to understand that men can have differences about perfect knowledge.

यद्विषया बुद्धिर्न व्यभिचरति, तत् सत् ; यद्विषया व्यभिचरति, तदसत्

BGh. 2.16

That alone is real (Sat) whose cognition is not mutable, and that is unreal whose cognition proves mutable.

सत्यमिति यद्रूपेण यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं न व्यभिचरति, तत्सत्यम् . यद्रूपेण यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं व्यभिचरति, तदनृतमित्युच्यते

Tai.Up. 2.1 Bh.

As for satya a thing is said to be true (satya), when it does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own; and a thing is said to be unreal when it changes the nature that is ascertained to be its own.

Section 22

References:

इत्येवं परस्परविरुद्धार्थकल्पनात आमिषार्थिन इव प्राणिनोऽन्योन्यविरुध्यमानार्थदर्शित्वात्परमार्थतत्त्वाद्दूरमेवापकृष्यन्ते

अतस्तन्मतमनादृत्य वेदान्तार्थतत्त्वमेकत्वदर्शनं प्रत्यादरवन्तो मुमुक्षवः स्युरिति तार्किकमतदोषप्रदर्शनं किञ्चिदुच्यतेऽस्माभिः ; न तु तार्किकवत्तात्पर्येण । तथैतदत्रोक्तम् – विवदत्स्वेव निक्षिप्य विरोधोद्भवकारणम् । तैः संरक्षितसद्बुद्धिः सुखं निर्वाति वेदवित्

Pra.Up. 6.3 Bh.

Thus, by postulating theories opposed to each other, like carnivores (fighting for a piece of flesh), they continually drift away from the supreme Reality owing to their proneness to discover such (distorted) interpretations of the conclusions arrived at by valid means of proof as may demolish each other's point of view. Therefore, we disclose a few flaws in the theories of the sophists not in the spirit of the sophists, but in order that people desirous of liberation may become devoted to the true import of the Upanisads, viz the realization of the nonduality of the Self, by ignoring those other theories. Thus, has it been said in this connection: 'Leaving the cause of the origination of all disputes amongst the disputants themselves, and keeping his good sense well protected by their example, the knower of the Vedas reposes happily.'

अभ्युपगते आत्मैकत्वे प्रमाणार्थश्चाभ्युपगतो भवता यदात्मैकत्वमभ्युपगच्छता . तदभ्युपगमे च विकल्पानुपपत्तिमाह शास्त्रम् ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्ऽ (बृ. उ. ४ . ५ . १४) इत्यादि

Pra.Up.6.3.Bh.

From the very fact of your firm affirmation of the unity of the Self it is admitted by you pari passu (from your personal experience) that scriptures serve the valid purpose (of revealing the nondulaity of the Self). And the following scriptural text declares with regard to that unity of the Self, to which you subscribe, that when the conviction arises, there is no scope for doubt: 'When to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what?' (Br.Up.4.5.14).

Section 23

References:

सर्वं ह्येतद्ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्म

Ma.Up. 2 (sruti)

All this is verily Brahman. This Ātman is Brahman...

तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्मांश्चाध्यस्येतरेतराविवेकेन अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्ऽ 'ममेदम्ऽ इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is a natural course of worldly conduct resulting from false knowledge, to superimpose the sense-objects and the subject of sense-objects which are absolutely different

from each other, and their respective attributes, mutually on each other, through failure to discriminate or distinguish either of them from each other,
And by coupling truth and untruth together and to imagine thus – 'I am this', 'This is mine'.

[**Note:** avidyā dṛṣṭi, adhyāropa dṛṣṭi, loka or laukika dṛṣṭi, svābhāvika dṛṣṭi, vyavahāra dṛṣṭi i.e., ignorant/erroneously attributed/worldly/natural/empirical - viewpoint, are all synonyms according to SSS].

Section 24

References:

मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यं नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन .

मृत्योः स मृत्युं गच्छति य इह नानेव पश्यति

Ka.Up. 2.1.11 (sruti)

By mind alone could this be obtained, there is no difference here whatsoever. Whoso here sees as though different, passes from death to death.

प्रागेकत्वविज्ञानादाचार्यागमसंस्कृतेन मनसैव इदं ब्रह्मैकरसम् आप्तव्यम् आत्मैव नान्यदस्तीति . आप्ते च नानात्वप्रत्युपस्थापिकाया अविद्याया निवृत्तत्वात् इह ब्रह्मणि नाना नास्ति किञ्चन अणुमात्रमपि . यस्तु

पुनरविद्यातिमिरदृष्टिं न मुञ्चति इह ब्रह्मणि नानेव पश्यति, स मृत्योर्मृत्युं गच्छत्येव स्वल्पमपि भेदमध्यारोपयन्नित्यर्थः

Ka.Up. 2.1.11 Bh.

Before attaining the knowledge of unity, this Brahman which is homogeneous, is to be attained, as identical with the Self, there being nothing else existing through the mind which is purified by the teacher and the scriptures. And since ignorance that presents diversity ceases on this attainment, (therefore) herein the Brahman diversity, even little does not exist. On the other hand, he who does not give up his vision of ignorance that is comparable to darkness; (and) sees as though there is diversity he does (indeed) go from death to death, even by superimposing the slightest difference. This is the idea.

यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मैवाभूद्विजानतः .
तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः

Isa. Up. 7 (sruti)

When a man realises that all beings are but the Self, what delusion is there, what grief, to that perceiver of oneness?

शोकश्च मोहश्च कामकर्मबीजमजानतो भवति, न त्वात्मैकत्वं विशुद्धं गगनोपमं पश्यतः

को मोहः कः शोक इति
शोकमोहयोरविद्याकार्ययोराक्षेपेणासम्भवप्रकाशनात् सकारणस्य
संसारस्यात्यन्तमेवोच्छेदः प्रदर्शितो भवति
Isa. Up. 7 Bh.
Sorrow and delusion come to the ignorant man who does not perceive the seed of desire and actions, but not to the man who realizes the absolute oneness of the Self which is like that of (open) space. The impossibility of grief and delusion, the effects of ignorance, having been indicated through the question, 'What delusion and what sorrow can there be? Te total eradication of worldly existence, with its cause, has been shown by that very fact.

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः .
अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते
Ka.Up. 2.3.14 (sruti)
When all longings that are in the heart vanish, then a mortal becomes immortal and attains Brahman here.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे
Mund.Up. 2.2.8 (sruti)
When that Self, which is both the high and the low, is realized, the knot of the heart gets united, all doubts become solved, and all one's actions become dissipated (disappear).

Section 25

References:

अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिंस्तद्बुद्धिरित्यवोचाम

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

We have already said that superimposition is the notion of that in something which is not that.

सर्वथापि तु अन्यस्यान्यधर्मावभासतां न व्यभिचरति

तथा च लोकेऽनुभवः – शुक्तिका हि रजतवद् अवभासते, एकश्चन्द्रः सद्वितीयवदिति

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

All the same, none of these definitions differ in any way as to the generally unreal assumption about the attributes of one thing as being the attributes of some other thing. Even so is our experience in the ordinary world. A mother-of-pearl appears as if it is silver. The moon, one as she is, appears as if she is two moons.

तमेतमेवंलक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

Learned men consider superimposition of this nature as Nescience (Avidyā).

तमेतमविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

And it is by entertaining i.e., adopting this mutual superimposition of the Self and the non-self, that all worldly conduct and Vedic actions depending on the means-of-proof (pramāṇa) and the objects of knowledge, and all scriptural injunctions and prohibitions, known as Nescience, [as well as Liberation, Mokṣa] are promoted.

एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is in this manner, that there is this beginningless and endless natural process of superimposition, which is of the nature of erroneous conception, and which promotes the notion of the Self as being an agent and experiencer, which is perceived by all.

Section 26

References:

न चायमस्ति नियमः – पुरोऽवस्थित एव विषये विषयान्तरम् अध्यसितव्यमिति

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

There is no such hard and fast rule, that it is only on an object right before one's eyes that another object should be superimposed.

तं गुरुरुवाच न, व्यभिचारात्। न हि वत्स, प्रसिद्धं प्रसिद्ध एवाध्यारोपयतीति नियन्तुं शक्यम्, आत्मन्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात्, गौरोऽहं कृष्णोऽहमिति देहधर्मस्य अहंप्रत्ययविषये आत्मनि, अहंप्रत्ययविषयस्य च आत्मनः देहे अयमहमस्मीति

UPS Prose 2.52

The teacher said to him (student): It is not so. There are exceptions. For, my child, there cannot be a rule that it is only well-known things that are superimposed on other well-known things, for we meet with the superimposition of certain things on the Self. Fairness and blackness, the properties of the body, are superimposed on the Self which is the object of the consciousness "I", and the same Self is superimposed on the body.

यत्तु उक्तम् - न समः दृष्टान्तः इति, तत् असत्. कथम्? अविद्याध्यासमात्रं हि दृष्टान्तदार्ष्टान्तिकयोः साधर्म्यं विवक्षितम्. तत् न व्यभिचरति. यत्तु ज्ञातरि व्यभिचरति इति मन्यसे, तस्यापि अनैकान्तिकत्वं दर्शितं जरादिभिः

BGh. 13.2

As for the statement that the illustration is not equally applicable - that is wrong. Objection: How?

Reply: Because what is intended as common between the illustration and the thing illustrated is merely the superimposition through ignorance. There is no disagreement as to that. However, as for your contention that the illustration fails regarding the Knower, that too has been shown to be inappropriate by citing the example of decrepitude etc.

गुरुराह श्रृणुस्: सत्यं प्रसिद्धौ देहात्मानौ। न तु स्थाणुपुरुषाविव विविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धौ। कथं तर्हि? नित्यमेव निरन्तराविविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया प्रसिद्धौ। न हि अयं देहः, अयमात्मा, इति विविक्ताभ्यां प्रत्ययाभ्यां देहात्मानौ गृह्णाति यः कश्चित्। अत एव हि मोमुह्यते लोकः आत्मानात्मविषये एवमात्मा, नैवमात्मा इति। इमं विशेषमाश्रित्यावोचं नैवं नियन्तुं शक्यमिति

UPS Prose 2.54

The teacher said, Listen. It is true that the Self and the body are well-known, but they are not well-known to all people to be objects of different knowledge, like a human being and a trunk of tree. (Question): How are they known then? (Reply): (They are always known) to be the objects of an undifferentiated knowledge. For, no one knows them to be the objects of different knowledge

saying, "This is the body" and "This is the Self". It is for this reason that people are deluded about the nature of the Self and of the non-Self and say, "The Self is of this nature" and "It is not of this nature". It was this peculiarity with reference to which I said that there was no such rule (viz., only well-known things could be superimposed on each other).

यस्य हि प्रसिद्धो वस्तुभेदः – यथा केसरादिमान् आकृतिविशेषोऽन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां सिंहशब्दप्रत्ययभाङ् मुख्योऽन्यः प्रसिद्धः । ततश्चान्यः पुरुषः प्रायिकैः क्रौर्यशौर्यादिभिः सिंहगुणैः सम्पन्नः सिद्धः, तस्य तस्मिन्पुरुषे सिंहशब्दप्रत्ययौ गौणौ भवतः; नाप्रसिद्धवस्तुभेदस्य । तस्य त्वन्यत्रान्यशब्दप्रत्ययौ भ्रान्तिनिमित्तावेव भवतः, न गौणौ । यथा मन्दान्धकारे स्थाणुरयम् इत्यगृह्यमाणविशेषे पुरुषशब्दप्रत्ययौ स्थाणुविषयौ, यथा वा शुक्तिकायाम् अकस्माद् रजतमिदम् इति निश्चितौ शब्दप्रत्ययौ । तद्वद्देहादिसङ्घाते अहम् इति निरुपचारेण शब्दप्रत्ययौ आत्मानात्माविवेकेनोत्पद्यमानौ कथं गौणौ शक्यौ वदितुम् । आत्मानात्मविवेकिनामपि पण्डितानाम् अजाविपालानाम् इवाविविक्तौ शब्दप्रत्ययौ भवतः । तस्माद् देहादिव्यतिरिक्तात्मास्तित्व-वादिनां देहादावहंप्रत्ययो मिथ्यैव, न गौणः

BSBh. 1.1.4

Just when the difference between two entities is patent to a man, as for instance when it is well-known to him that an animal with a mane etc. and a peculiar proud form,

which by the method of positive and negative instances, deserves to have a designation, viz., a lion, applied to it, is a distinct and separate entity. And when there also is another person who is endowed with the usual qualities of a lion such as fierceness and boldness, and who is a different entity altogether and is quite distinct from the former (i.e. the lion), Then the consciousness (Pratyaya, 'notion') in such a man, of the other man's lioninity, and the use by such a man of the term 'lion' for that other man, is in a secondary or figurative sense, and not when the difference between the two is not known to him.

Hence a man's consciousness and the use by him of one term for another (when he is not conscious of the difference between two entities) are **caused by his confusion alone and are not in a secondary or figurative sense.** Just as in the twilight, when a pillar is not cognized as such, a man's consciousness of it and his use of the term 'man' for it. Or when in the case of a mother-of-pearl his consciousness of it and his use of the term 'silver' for it, is prima facie not in a secondary or figurative sense. Similarly, how can the consciousness of and the use by a man of the term 'I' with respect to the aggregate of body etc., be said to be in a secondary or figurative sense, when his consciousness and his use

of the term 'I' for the body are caused by his not being able to discriminate between the Self and that which is not the Self? Even in the case of those learned people who can discriminate between the Self and the non-Self, their consciousness and use of the term 'I' for the body, is, like that of the shepherd's (Ajāvi-pāla), due to their inability to discriminate between the Self and the non-Self. Therefore, **to those who hold that there is a self distinct from the body, the notion of 'I' in the body etc. is simply false, not secondary.**

कथं तर्हि प्रत्यक्षाद्यप्रसिद्धात्मनि देहाध्यारोपणा, देहे चात्मारोपणा ?

नायं दोषः, स्वभावप्रसिद्धत्वादात्मनः । न हि कादाचित्कसिद्धावेव अध्यारोपणा न नित्यसिद्धौ इति नियन्तुं शक्यम्, आकाशे तलमलाद्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात् ।

UPS Prose 2.60-61

Disciple: How can then there be the superimposition of the body etc., on the Self which is not known by sense-perception etc., and that of the Self on the body?

Teacher: It is not a (valid) objection. For the Self is naturally well-known. As we see the form of a frying pan and blueness superimposed on the sky, there cannot be a rule that it is things known occasionally only on which

superimposition is possible and not on things always known.

अपरोक्षत्वाच्च प्रत्यगात्मप्रसिद्धेः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

and it is also well-known that the Universal Self (***ātman***) can be directly and intuitively perceived.

[**Note**: adhyāsa, adhyāropa, viparyāsa, viparita pratyaya, anyathājñāna, mithyājñāna, avidyā, ajñāna, mṛṣājñāna, viparīta jñāna, mithyāpratyaya, anavabodha, apratibodha, anavagama, superimposition or misconception are all synonyms according to SSS].

Section 27

References:

तथापि अन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकताम् अन्योन्य-धर्माश्चाध्यस्य

इतरेतराविवेकेन अत्यन्त-विविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः,

मिथ्याज्ञान-निमित्तः, सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य, 'अहमिदम्' 'ममेदम्' इति

नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is a natural course of worldly conduct, resulting from false-knowledge, to superimpose the sense-objects and the subject of sense-objects which are absolutely different from each other and their respective attributes, mutually on each other, through failure to discriminate or distinguish either of them from each other. And by coupling truth and untruth together and to imagine thus – 'I am this', 'This is mine'.

यत्पुनरुक्तम् -- देहस्यात्मन्यसत्त्वे प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः स्यादिति, तन्न, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः आत्मनि देहस्य सत्त्वानुपलब्धेः। न ह्यात्मनि -- कुण्डे बदरम्, क्षीरे सर्पिः, तिले तैलम्, भित्तौ चित्रमिव च -- प्रत्यक्षादिभिः देह उपलभ्यते। तस्मान्न प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः

UPS Prose 2.59

It is not a fact that the absolute non-existence of the body contradicts sense-perception etc., inasmuch as the existence of the body in the Self is not known by these evidences. The body is not known to exist in the Self by perception etc., like a plum in a hole, ghee in milk, oil in sesame or a picture painted on a wall. There is, therefore, no contradiction to sense-perception etc.

कः पुनः अयं क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः संयोगः अभिप्रेतः ? न तावत् रज्ज्वेव घटस्य अवयवसंश्लेषद्वारकः सम्बन्धविशेषः संयोगः क्षेत्रेण क्षेत्रज्ञस्य सम्भवति, आकाशवत् निरवयवत्वात् । नापि समवायलक्षणः तन्तुपटयोरिव क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः इतरेतरकार्यकारणभावानभ्युपगमात् इति, उच्यते - क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः इतरेतरतद्धर्माध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः इतरेतरतद्धर्माध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः, रज्जुशुक्तिकादीनां तद्विवेकज्ञानाभावात् अध्यारोपितसर्परजतादिसंयोगवत्

BGh. 13.26

Objection: Of what sort is this union of Kshetra and Kshetrajna meant to be? The union of Kshetrajna with Kshetra cannot certainly be a relation through contact (samyoga) of each other's parts, as between a rope and a vessel, inasmuch as Kshetrajna is, like the akasa, without parts. Nor can it be of the nature of samavaya or inseparable inherence, inasmuch as it cannot be admitted that Kshetra and Kshetrajna are related to each other as cause and effect. This is being explained.

Answer: The union between the kshetra, the object, and the Kshetrajna, the subject, which are of different nature, is one of mutual adhyasa (superimposition) between the attributes of one and the other. Due to absence of discrimination between the nature of the kshetra and the Kshetrajna, both these are confused, even as a snake

and silver are superimposed on a rope and a pearl-oyster respectively in the absence of discriminative knowledge about these two.

न, अनित्यत्वपरार्थत्वप्रसङ्गात्। संहतत्वात् परार्थत्वम् अनित्यत्वं च वंशस्तम्भादिवदेव। किंच -- यस्तु परैर्देहेन संहतः कल्पित आत्मा स संहतत्वात् परार्थः। तेन असंहतः परोऽन्यो नित्यः सिद्धस्तावत्

UPS Prose 2.56

It is not so. For in that case there arises the possibility of the Self existing for the benefit of another and being non-eternal. The Self, if in contact with the body, would be existing for the benefit of another and be non-eternal like the combination of pillars and bamboos. Moreover, the Self, supposed by other philosophers to be conjoined with the body, must have an existence for the sake of another. It is, therefore, concluded that devoid of contact

with the body the Self is eternal and characteristically different from it.

न, स्वत एवात्मनः आकाशस्येव असंहतत्वाभ्युपगमात् सर्वेण असंहतः स च आत्मेति न निरात्मको देहादिः सर्वः स्यात्। यथा चाकाशं सर्वेणासंहतमिति सर्वं न निराकाशं भवति, एवम्। तस्मान्न वैनाशिकपक्षप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात्

UPS Prose 2.58

Teacher: No. (You are not right). For we admit that, like the ether, the Self is by nature free from contact with anything. Just as things are not bereft of the ether though it is not in contact with them, so, the body etc., are not devoid of the Self though It is not in contact with them. Therefore, the objection of the Nihilist position coming in does not arise.

श्रोत्रादीनामेव तु संहतानां व्यापारेणालोचनसङ्कल्पाध्यवसायलक्षणेन फलावसानलिङ्गेनावगम्यते – अस्ति हि श्रोत्रादिभिरसंहतः, यत्प्रयोजनप्रयुक्तः श्रोत्रादिकलापः गृहादिवदिति । संहतानां परार्थत्वादवगम्यते श्रोत्रादीनां प्रयोक्ता । तस्मादनुरूपमेवेदं प्रतिवचनं श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रमित्यादि

Kena.Up. 1.2. Bh.

But He can be known (as existing unmixed with the ear etc.) from the logical necessity that such activities as deliberation, volition, determination, of those very composite things, viz the ear etc., must be meant for some one's benefit. Just as in the case of a house, so also (in this case) there does exist some one, standing outside the conglomeration of ears etc., by whose necessity is impelled the group of ears etc. Thus from the fact that composite things exist for the need of some one else, a director of the ears etc. can be known (i.e., inferred). Hence the reply, 'He is the Ear of the ear', etc. is quite appropriate.

अप्रत्यक्षेऽपि ह्याकाशे बालाः तलमलिनतादि अध्यस्यन्ति

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

Ignorant people superimpose the attributes of concavity (Tala) and dustiness etc. on the Ākāśa (Space) which is not directly visible.

[**Note**: asat, asatya anṛta, mithyā vitatha, mṛṣā which indicate false appearance are all synonyms according to SSS].

Section 28

References:

देहात्मप्रत्ययो यद्वत् प्रमाणत्वेन कल्पितः

लौकिकं तद्वदेवेदं प्रमाणं त्वाऽऽत्मनिश्चयात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Just as the idea of the Self being the body is assumed as valid (in ordinary life), so also **all the Pramāṇas (i.e. the means of right knowledge such as perception etc.) are valid only until the one and the only one Self is properly realized.**

देहेन्द्रियादिषु अहंममाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तौ प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः। न हीन्द्रियाण्यनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः सम्भवति। न चाधिष्ठानमन्तरेण इन्द्रियाणां व्यापारः सम्भवति

न चानध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद्व्याप्रियते। न चैतस्मिन् सर्वस्मिन्नसति असङ्गस्यात्मनः प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते। न च प्रमातृत्वमन्तरेण प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति। तस्मादविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति।

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

We reply – Because in the case of a person who has no such false sense of 'I' or 'Mine' with regard to the body and the sense-organs, there is no possibility of his being desirous of knowledge, as there is no possibility of the operation of the means of right knowledge. Without the

employment of the sense-organs, perception is not possible. And without a basis (such as a body) the operation of senses organs is not possible. And nobody ever acts or is concerned with a mere body which is not superimposed by the notion of the Self. Neither in the absence of all this is it possible either for the Self which is free from all contact, to be a knowing agent,

Nor in the absence of the condition of a knowing agent is any operation of the means of right knowledge possible. Therefore, means of right knowledge such as direct perception etc., and the Śāstras have for their object that which is dependent on ignorance.

पश्वादिभिश्चाविशेषात् । यथा हि पश्वादयः शब्दादिभिः श्रोत्रादीनां सम्बन्धे सति, शब्दादिविज्ञाने प्रतिकूले जाते ततो निवर्तन्ते, अनुकूले च प्रवर्तन्ते; यथा दण्डोद्यतकरं पुरुषमभिमुखमुपलभ्य 'मां हन्तुम् अयमिच्छति' इति पलायितुमारभन्ते, हरिततृणपूर्णपाणिम् उपलभ्य तं प्रति अभिमुखीभवन्ति । एवं पुरुषा अपि व्युत्पन्नचित्ताः क्रूरदृष्टीनाक्रोशतः खड्गोद्यतकरान् बलवत उपलभ्य ततो निवर्तन्ते, तद्विपरीतान् प्रति प्रवर्तन्ते अतः समानः पश्वादिभिः पुरुषाणां प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः । पश्वादीनां च प्रसिद्धः अविवेकपूर्वकः प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः । तत्सामान्यदर्शनाद् व्युत्पत्तिमतामपि पुरुषाणां प्रत्यक्षादि-व्यवहारस्तत्कालः समान इति निश्चीयते

This a person has in common with the animals etc. Just as animals etc., when sounds are in contact with the ear etc., and the knowledge of the same is not favourable, go away from them, and when it is favourable, are attracted towards them. As for instance, finding in front of themselves a man holding up a stick, they begin to run away from him, thinking that he wishes to strike them, but when they find him in front of themselves with his hands full of green grass, approach him; Similarly men even when they are able to discriminate properly, (finding before them) strong men who have swords in their upraised hands and who have a fierce aspect, and who are shouting wildly, go away from them, and approach those who are of an opposite nature. And thus, the employment of the means of right knowledge and the objects of knowledge is common both to animals and men. Now, the employment of the means of right knowledge such as direct perception etc. by animals is well-known as being due to their failure to discriminate properly. Similarly, it is thus determined, that even in the case of properly discriminating persons their employment of the means of right knowledge such as direct perception, which is seen to be common to them with animals, is at similar times, also similar.

Section 29

References:

तमेतमेवंलक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते

तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

Learned men consider superimposition of this nature as Nescience (Avidyā) And they (further) say that knowledge (Vidyā) is the determination of the real nature of a thing by discrimination.

यथाशास्त्रं क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञलक्षणभेदपरिज्ञानपूर्वकं प्राक् दर्शितरूपात् क्षेत्रात् मुञ्जादिव इषीकां यथोक्तलक्षणं क्षेत्रज्ञं प्रविभज्य 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यतेऽ (भ। गी। १३ । १२) इत्यनेन निरस्तसर्वोपाधिविशेषं ज्ञेयं ब्रह्मस्वरूपेण यः पश्यति, क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मितहस्तिस्वप्नदृष्टवस्तुगन्धर्वनगरादिवत् 'असदेव सदिव अवभासतेऽ इति एवं निश्चितविज्ञानः यः, तस्य यथोक्तसम्यग्दर्शनविरोधात् अपगच्छति मिथ्याज्ञानम्

BGh. 13.26

After having known the distinction between and the characteristics of the field and the Knower of the field according to the scriptures, and having separated, like a stalk from the Muñja-grass, the above-described Knower of the field from the field whose characteristics have been

shown earlier, he who realizes the Knowable (that is the Knower of the field) – which, in accordance with 'That is neither called being nor non-being' (BG.13.12), is devoid of all distinctions created by adjuncts – as identical with Brahman; and he who has the firm realization that the field is surely unreal like an elephant created by magic, a thing seen in a dream, an imaginary city seen in the sky, etc., and it appears as though real – for him false knowledge becomes eradicated, since it is opposed to the right knowledge described above.

एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः
कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is in this manner, that there is this beginningless and endless natural process of superimposition, which is of the nature of erroneous conception and which promotes the notion of the Self as being an agent and experiencer, which is perceived by all.

तत्रैवं सति, यत्र यदध्यासः, तत्कृतेन दोषेण गुणेन वा अणुमात्रेणापि स न सम्बध्यते

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

This being so, that on which some other thing is superimposed is not in the least affected by the faults and merits of the thing superimposed.

अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is with a view to destroy this cause of all evil, and for acquiring the knowledge of the unity of the Self, that all Vedānta is begun.

अतो विलक्षणोऽनामरूपकर्मात्मकोऽद्वयो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावोऽपि क्रियाकारकफलभेदादिविपर्ययेणावभासते । अतोऽस्मात्क्रियाकारकफलभेदस्वरूपात् 'एतावदिदम्ऽ इति साध्यसाधनरूपाद्विरक्तस्य कामादिदोषकर्मबीजभूताविद्यानिवृत्तये रज्ज्वामिव सर्पविज्ञानापनयाय ब्रह्मविद्या आरभ्यते

Br.Up. Upod. Bh.

Although the Self is different from them, has nothing to do with name, form and action, is one without a second and is eternal, pure, enlightened and free by nature, yet It appears as just the reverse of this, as consisting of differences of action, its factors and its results, and so on. Therefore, for the removal of ignorance, the seed of

defects such as desire and of action–like the removal of the idea of a snake from a rope–with regard to a man who is disgusted with this universe of means and ends, consisting of actions, their factors and their results– having realised that they are just so much, the knowledge of Brahman is being set forth.

[**Note**: brahmavidyā, ātmavidyā, adhyātmavidyā, ātmaikatvavidyā, brahmaikatvavidyā, paramātmavidyā, paramātmavijñāna, meaning, the names given to the Intuitive knowledge which determines the essential nature of Atman are all synonyms according to SSS].

Section 30

References:

न, अविद्यायाः तामसत्वात्। तामसो हि प्रत्ययः, आवरणात्मकत्वात् अविद्या विपरीतग्राहकः, संशयोपस्थापको वा, अग्रहणात्मको वा, विवेकप्रकाशभावे तदभावात्, तामसे च आवरणात्मके तिमिरादिदोषे सति अग्रहणादेः अविद्यात्रयस्य उपलब्धेः

BGh. 13.2

No, because ignorance is of the nature of tamas. Since ignorance has the nature of covering, it is indeed a notion born of tamas; it makes **one perceive contrarily, or it arouses doubt, or it leads to non-perception.** For it disappears with the dawn of discrimination. And the three kind of ignorance, viz. non-perception etc. [Etc.: perceive

contrarily and doubt.], are experienced when there are such defects as blindness etc. which are forms of tamas and have the nature of veiling.

न हि अग्निरुष्णः प्रकाशश्च इति विज्ञानोत्पत्तौ यस्मिन्नाश्रये तदुत्पन्नम् , तस्मिन्नेवाश्रये शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वा इत्यविद्याया उत्पत्तिः । नापि संशयः अज्ञानं वा

Isa.Up. 18. Bh.

When the knowledge that the fire is hot and bright dawns in a person, never indeed will exist in that very person, the misapprehension, doubt, or ignorance that the fire is cold and nonilluminating.

यथा लोके द्रष्टुश्चक्षुष आलोकेन संयोगो यत्कालः, तत्काल एव रूपाभिव्यक्तिः, एवमात्मविषयं विज्ञानं यत्कालम् , तत्काल एव तद्विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावः स्यात्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

As in the world a form is revealed as soon as the observer's eye is in touch with light, similarly the very moment that one has a knowledge of the Supreme Self, ignorance regarding It must disappear.

यदि ज्ञानाभावः, यदि संशयज्ञानम् , यदि विपरीतज्ञानं वा उच्यते अज्ञानमिति, सर्वं हि तत् ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्यते

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

If the absence of knowledge, or knowledge not free from doubt or false notion, is spoken of by the term ignorance, all this is indeed removed by knowledge.

Section 31

References:

एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

It is in this manner, that there is this beginningless and endless natural process of superimposition, which is of the nature of erroneous conception and which promotes the notion of the Self as being an agent and experiencer, which is perceived by all.

तमेतमविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेय-व्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्ष-पराणि

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

And it is by entertaining i.e., adopting this reciprocal superimposition of the Self and the non-self, that all worldly conduct and Vedic actions depending on the means-of-proof (pramāṇa) and the objects of knowledge, and all scriptural injunctions and prohibitions, known as Ignorance, [as well as Liberation, Mokṣa] are promoted.

Section 32

References:

बुद्ध्वानिमित्ततां सत्यां हेतुं पृथगनाप्नुवन् ।

वीतशोकं तथा काममभयं पदमश्नुते

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.78 (sruti)

Having (thus) realised the absence of causality as the Ultimate Truth, and also not finding any other cause (for birth), one attains to that (the state of liberation) which is free from grief, desire and fear.

यथोक्तेन न्यायेन जन्मनिमित्तस्य द्वयस्य अभावात् ।

अनिमित्ततां च सत्यां परमार्थरूपां बुद्ध्वा हेतुं धर्मादिकारणं देवादियोनिप्राप्तये पृथगनाप्नुवन् अनुपाददानः त्यक्तबाह्यैषणः सन् कामशोकादिवर्जितम् अविद्यादिरहितम् अभयं पदम् अश्नुते, पुनर्न जायत इत्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.78 Bh.

Since, for the reasons already advanced, duality which is the cause of birth, does not exist. Having realised the uncaused Truth of the nature of supreme Reality and having withdrawn oneself from obtaining any further cause, i.e., virtue etc, that leads to birth among the gods and others, in other words, having abandoned all longings for external objects, one attains the state of fearlessness that is devoid of delusion and grief and that is free from ignorance etc., meaning one is not born again.

तथा च लोकेऽनुभवः – शुक्तिका हि रजतवद् अवभासते, एकश्चन्द्रः सद्वितीयवदिति

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

Even so is our experience in the ordinary world. A mother-of-pearl appears as if it is silver. The moon, one as she is, appears as if she is two moons.

प्रत्येत्येव हि केवलं रजतमिति, न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति

BSBh. 4.1.5

A man merely perceives it as silver, when actually no silver is there.

तथापि अन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकताम् अन्योन्य-धर्माश्चाध्यस्य

इतरेतराविवेकेन अत्यन्त-विविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः,

मिथ्याज्ञान-निमित्तः, सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य, 'अहमिदम्' 'ममेदम्' इति

नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

All the same, It is a natural course of worldly conduct resulting from false-knowledge, to superimpose the sense-objects and the subject of sense-objects which are absolutely different from each other, And their respective attributes, mutually on each other, through failure to discriminate or distinguish either of them from each other. And by coupling truth and untruth together and to imagine thus – 'I am this', 'This is mine'

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः

इतरेतरतद्धर्माध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः, रज्जुशुक्तिकादीनां

तद्विवेकज्ञानाभावात् अध्यारोपितसर्परजतादिसंयोगवत्

BGh. 13.26

The association of the field and the Knower of the field - which are the object and the subject, respectively, and are of different natures - is in the form of superimposition of each on the other as also of their qualities, as a

consequence of the absence of discrimination between the real natures of the field and the Knower of the field. This is like the association of a rope, nacre, etc. with the superimposed snake, silver, etc. owing to the absence of discrimination between them.

Section 33

References:

यथा गृह्यमाणाया अपि शुक्तिकाया विपर्ययेण रजताभासाया अग्रहणं विपरीतज्ञानव्यवधानमात्रम् , तथा ग्रहणं ज्ञानमात्रमेव, विपरीतज्ञानव्यवधानापोहार्थत्वाज्ज्ञानस्य ; एवमिहाप्यात्मनोऽलाभः अविद्यामात्रव्यवधानम्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Just as when a mother of pearl appears through mistake as a piece of silver, the nonapprehension of the former, although it is being perceived all the while, is merely due to the obstruction of the false impression, and its (subsequent) apprehension is but knowledge, for this is what removes the obstruction of false impression, similarly here also the nonattainment of the Self is merely due to the obstruction of ignorance.

Section 34

References:

नासतो विद्यते भावो नाभावो विद्यते सतः ।

उभयोरपि दृष्टोऽन्तस्त्वनयोस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः

BG. 2.16 (smriti)

Of the unreal no being there is; there is no nonbeing of the real. Of both these is the truth seen by the seers of the Essence.

अत इदम् अविद्यायाः सतत्त्वमुक्तं भवति – सर्वात्मानं सन्तम् असर्वात्मत्वेन ग्राहयति, आत्मनः अन्यत् वस्त्वन्तरम् अविद्यमानं प्रत्युपस्थापयति, आत्मानम् असर्वमापादयति । ततस्तद्विषयः कामो भवति ; यतो भिद्यते कामतः, क्रियामुपादत्ते, ततः फलम्

Br.Up. 4.3.20 Bh.

Hence the nature of ignorance is shown to be this, that the Purusha inspite of being one with all, regards itself as not being one with all, owing to ignorance which presents objects, other than the Self, that are non-existent, and makes the Self something that does not identify itself with all. Thence arises the desire for that from which he is separated; desire prompts him to action, which produces results.

अप्रकाशो यथादित्ये नास्ति ज्योतिःस्वभावतः ।

नित्यबोधस्वरूपत्वान् नाज्ञानं तद्वदात्मनि

UPS Metrical 16.37

Just as darkness does not exist in the sun, since it has light as its nature, **so there is no ignorance in Atman** since It has constant knowledge as Its nature.

Section 35

References:

यद्येवं प्रतिबुद्धोऽसि, नास्ति कस्यचिदप्रबोधः

BSBh. 4.1.3

If you have realized it to be so (i.e. that you are the Lord) then (in that case) there is none that happens to be without any such realization.

न हि क्वचित्साक्षाद्वस्तुधर्मस्यापोद्री दृष्टा कर्त्री वा ब्रह्मविद्या, अविद्यायास्तु सर्वत्रैव निवर्तिका दृश्यते । तथा इहाप्यब्रह्मत्वमसर्वत्वं चाविद्याकृतमेव निवर्त्यतां ब्रह्मविद्यया

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

This knowledge has never been observed either directly to remove some characteristic of a thing or to create one. But everywhere it is seen to remove ignorance. Similarly,

here also let the idea of not being Brahman and not being all that is due to ignorance, be removed by the knowledge of Brahman.

यथा कश्चित्संतमसे पतितां काञ्चिद्रज्जुमहिं मन्यमानो भीतो वेपमानः पलायते । तं चापरो ब्रूयात् 'मा भैषीः नायमहिः रज्जुरेव' इति । स च तदुपश्रुत्याहिकृतं भयमुत्सृजेद्वेपथुं पलायनं च । न त्वहिबुद्धिकाले तदपगमकाले च । वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषः स्यात्

BSBh. 1.4.6

Just as a man mistaking a rope lying about in semi-darkness to be a snake, is frightened and tremblingly runs away. But when another person assures him that it is merely a rope and not a snake, and that he should not be frightened, overcomes his own fear on hearing so and ceases to tremble and to run away, while both during the time he wrongly fancied the rope to be a snake, and after his mistaken notion about it is removed, **The thing (the rope) was the same all through and without any difference.**

Section 36

References:

अत्र आह - सा अविद्या कस्य इति। यस्य दृश्यते तस्य एव। कस्य दृश्यते इति। अत्र उच्यते - 'अविद्या कस्य दृश्यते? ' इति प्रश्नः निरर्थकः।

कथम्? दृश्यते चेत् अविद्या, तद्वन्तमपि पश्यसि। न च तद्वति उपलभ्यमाने 'सा कस्य? ' इति प्रश्नो युक्तः। न हि गोमति उपलभ्यमाने 'गावः कस्य? ' इति प्रश्नः अर्थवान् भवति। ननु विषमो दृष्टान्तः। गवां तद्वतश्च प्रत्यक्षत्वात् तत्सम्बन्धोऽपि प्रत्यक्ष इति प्रश्नो निरर्थकः। न तथा अविद्या तद्वांश्च प्रत्यक्षौ, यतः प्रश्नः निरर्थकः स्यात्। अप्रत्यक्षेण अविद्यावता अविद्यासम्बन्धे ज्ञाते, किं तव स्यात् ? अविद्यायाः अनर्थहेतुत्वात् परिहर्तव्या स्यात्। यस्य अविद्या, सः तां परिहरिष्यति

BGh. 13.2

Here, (the opponent) asks: **To whom does ignorance belong?** (Reply): **It belongs verily to him by whom it is experienced!**

Objection: In whom is it perceived?

Reply: Here the answer is: It is pointless to ask, 'In whom is ignorance experienced?'

Objection: How?

Reply: If **ignorance be perceived (by you), then you perceive its possessor as well**. Moreover, when that possessor of ignorance is perceived, it is not reasonable to ask, 'In whom is it perceived?' For, when an owner of

cattle is seen, the question, ‘To whom do the cattle belong’, does not become meaningful.

Objection: Well, is not the illustration dissimilar? Since, the cattle and their owner are directly perceived, their relation also is directly perceived. Hence the question is meaningless. Ignorance and its possessor are not directly perceived in that manner, in which case the question would have been meaningless.

Reply: What will it matter to you if you know the relation of ignorance with a person who is not directly perceived as possessed of ignorance?

Opponent: Since ignorance is a source of evil, therefore it should be got rid of.

Reply: He to whom ignorance belongs will get rid of it!

कस्य पुनरयम् अप्रबोध इति चेत्, यस्त्वं पृच्छसि तस्य ते - इति वदामः ।

ननु अहमीश्वर एवोक्तः श्रुत्या - यद्येवं प्रतिबुद्धोऽसि, नास्ति कस्यचिदप्रबोधः । योऽपि दोषश्चोद्यते कैश्चित् - अविद्यया किल आत्मनः सद्वितीयत्वात्

अद्वैतानुपपत्तिरिति, सोऽपि एतेन प्रत्युक्तः

BSBh. 4.1.3

If the opponent were to say – "Who in that case, is the one, that is in ignorance i.e., in need of such realization?"

We reply – It is you yourself, who are asking this question.

If the opponent were to say – "Oh, but the Scriptures declare that I myself am the Lord",

(We answer) – If you have realized it to be so (i.e., that you are the Lord) then (in that case) there is none that happens to be without any such realization.

This also disposes of the objection, urged by some, that a system of nonduality cannot be established because the Self is affected with duality by ignorance.

सत्यामेव च नैसर्गिक्यामविद्यायां लोकवेदव्यवहारावतार इति

BSBh. 3.2.15

That, it is **only in the presence of ignorance** (avidyā) which is natural, that ordinary **worldly phenomenal life, and conduct in accordance with the Scriptures, becomes possible**

Section 37

References:

ब्रह्मण्यविद्यानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्

न, ब्रह्मणि विद्याविधानात् । न हि शुक्तिकायां रजताध्यारोपणेऽसति शुक्तिकात्वं ज्ञाप्यते चक्षुर्गोचरापन्नायाम् – 'इयं शुक्तिका न रजतम्ऽ इति

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: But is not ignorance out of place in Brahman? Reply: Not so, for knowledge regarding Brahman has been enjoined. When there has been no superimposition of silver on a motherorpearl, and it is directly visible, no one takes the trouble to say it is a motherofpearl, and not silver.

ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीत्तदात्मानमेवावेदहं ब्रह्मास्मीति तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवदिति

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

'This was indeed Brahman in the beginning. It knew only Itself as, "I am Brahman." Therefore, It became all.'

इदं शरीरस्थं यद्गृह्यते, अग्रे प्राक्प्रतिबोधादपि, ब्रह्मैवासीत् , सर्वं च इदम् ; किन्त्वप्रतिबोधात् 'अब्रह्मास्मि असर्वं चऽ इत्यात्मन्यध्यारोपात् 'कर्ताहं क्रियावान्फलानां च भोक्ता सुखी दुःखी संसारीऽ इति च

अध्यारोपयति ; परमार्थस्तु ब्रह्मैव तद्विलक्षणं सर्वं च । तत् कथञ्चिदाचार्येण दयालुना प्रतिबोधितम् 'नासि संसारीऽ इति आत्मानमेवावेत्स्वाभाविकम् ; अविद्याध्यारोपितविशेषवर्जितमिति एव शब्दस्यार्थः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

This (Brahman as Jiva) seen to be dwelling in the body was Brahman Itself even prior to realisation. Similarly, all this was Brahman. But, on account of ignorance, it superimposed on itself the view, 'I am not Brahman'; 'I am the enjoyer of the results', 'I am happy', 'I am miserable', and 'I am the transmigrating self'. But really, it is Brahman Itself, different from all what is mentioned above, and is all. However, being enlightened by the compassionate teacher who said, 'You are not the transmigrating self', It knew Itself only, the natural Self. The meaning of the particle eva (in atmanam eva) is that it knew the Self devoid of differentiations which were superimposed out of ignorance.

Section 38

References:

न ब्रूमः – शुक्तिकायामिव ब्रह्मण्यतद्धर्माध्यारोपणा नास्तीति ; किं तर्हि न ब्रह्म स्वात्मन्यतद्धर्माध्यारोपनिमित्तम् अविद्याकर्तृ चेति

भवत्येवं नाविद्याकर्तृ भ्रान्तं च ब्रह्म । किन्तु नैव अब्रह्म अविद्यकर्ता चेतनो भ्रान्तोऽन्य इष्यते – 'नान्योऽतोऽस्ति विज्ञाताऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ७ । २३) 'नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञातृऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ११) 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) 'आत्मानमेवावेत् अहं ब्रह्मास्मिऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) 'अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति, न स वेदऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: We do not say that there is no superimposition on Brahman of attributes not belonging to It, as in the case of a mother of pearl, but that Brahman is not the cause of the superimposition of these attributes on Itself, nor the author of ignorance.

Reply: Let it be so. Brahman is not the author of ignorance nor subject to error. **But it is not admitted that there is any other conscious entity but Brahman which is the author of ignorance or subject to error. Witness such Sruti texts as, 'There is no other knower but Him' (Br.Up. 3.7.23),** 'There is no other knower but This' (Br.Up. 3.8.11), 'Thou art That' (Ch.Up. 6.8.7), 'It knew only Itself as, "I am Brahman" '(Br.Up. 1.4.10), and 'He (who worships another god thinking), "He is one, and I am another," does not know' (Br.Up. 1.4.10).

Section 39

References:

नन्वेवं शास्त्रोपदेशानर्थक्यमिति - बाढमेवम् , अवगते अस्त्वेवानर्थक्यम्

अवगमानर्थक्यमपीति चेत् न, अनवगमनिवृत्तेर्दृष्टत्वात्

तन्निवृत्तेरप्यनुपपत्तिरेकत्व इति चेत् न, दृष्टविरोधात् ; दृश्यते हृयेकत्वविज्ञानादेवानवगमनिवृत्तिः ; दृश्यमानमप्यनुपपन्नमिति ब्रुवतो दृष्टविरोधः स्यात् ; न च दृष्टविरोधः केनचिदप्यभ्युपगम्यते ; न च दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नं नाम, दृष्टत्वादेव दर्शनानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् तत्राप्येषैव युक्तिः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: In that case scriptural instruction is useless.

Reply: Quite so, let it be, when the truth has been known.

Objection: But it is also useless to know the truth.

Reply: No, for we see it removes ignorance.

Objection: If there is unity, this removal of ignorance also is impossible.

Reply: Not so, for it contradicts experience. We actually see that the knowledge of unity alone dispels ignorance. If you deny an observed fact, saying it is impossible, you would be contradicting experience, a thing which nobody

will allow. Nor is there any question of impossibility with regard to an observed fact, because it has actually been observed.

Objection: But this observation also is impossible.

Reply: There also the same logic will apply.

(Supplement: न हि दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नं नाम (BSBh. 4.1.2),

for nothing is illogical about facts directly perceived)

Section 40

References:

दर्शयति च श्रुतिः पररूपप्रतिषेधेनैव ब्रह्म – निर्विशेषत्वात् – 'अथात आदेशो नेति नेति' (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' (के। उ। १ । ४) 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (तै। उ। २ । ४ । १) इत्येवमाद्या । बाष्कलिना च बाध्वः पृष्टः सन् अवचनेनैव ब्रह्म प्रोवाचेति श्रूयते – 'स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूष्णीं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि । उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा' इति । तथा स्मृतिष्वपि परप्रतिषेधेनैवोपदिश्यते – 'ज्ञेयं यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वामृतमश्नुते । अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' (भ। गी। १३ । १२) इत्येवमाद्यासु । तथा विश्वरूपधरो नारायणो नारदमुवाचेति स्मर्यते – 'माया ह्येषा मया सृष्टा यन्मां पश्यसि नारद ।' (म। भा। १२ । ३३९

। ४५) 'सर्वभूतगुणैर्युक्तं नैवं मां ज्ञातुमर्हसिऽ (म। भा। १२ । ३३९ । ४६) इति

BSBh. 3.2.17

The Scriptures also indicate that Brahman has no other distinctive characteristic, by the denial of any other form (for it), thus – "Hence now the instruction is – (Whatever is said to be Brahman) is not so (i.e., Brahman)" (Br.Up. 2.3.6); "Other indeed it is than that which is known and not known" (KenU.1.4); "Wherefrom, having failed to attain it, words along with the mind turn back" (Tait.Up. 2.4.1). Scriptures also tell us, how, questioned by Baṣkali, Bādhva explained Brahman to him (i.e., Baṣkali) merely by his silence, thus – "He (i.e. Baṣkali) said, Oh Bādhva, teach me (what Brahman is), But he (Bādhva) remained silent And when he was thus questioned a second and a third time, Replied –'Indeed, have I told you (by my silence), but of course you do not understood. This Self (Ātmā) is one from which duality has been swept away. Similarly, it is by denying everything else (to be Brahman) that instruction is given in Smṛtis, such as – "I will explain to you that which is the object of knowledge, and having known which, immortality is attained.
Brahman which is beginningless and transcendent and that, which is said to be neither Sat nor Asat [neither (an object) that is, nor is not]" (BhG.13.12). Smṛti also says, how, Nārāyaṇa assuming the cosmic form of the universe,

spoke to Nārada “Oh Nārada, when you see me as one endowed with the attributes of all beings, it is only an illusion of my own creation, But you should not understand me to be really so”.

स होवाचैतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गि ब्राह्मणा
अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घमलोहितमस्नेहमच्छायमतमोऽवाय्वना
काशमसङ्गमरसमगन्धमचक्षुष्कमश्रोत्रमवागमनोऽतेजस्कमप्राणममुखम
मात्रमनन्तरमबाह्यं न तदश्नाति किञ्चन न तदश्नाति कश्चन
Br.Up. 3.8.8 (sruti)

He said: O Gārgī, the knowers of Brahman say, this Immutable (Brahman) is that. It is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, neither red colour nor oiliness, neither shadow nor darkness, neither air nor ether, unattached, neither savour nor odour, without eyes or ears, without the vocal organ or mind, nonluminous, without the vital force or mouth, not a measure, and without interior or exterior. It does not eat anything, nor is It eaten by anybody.

सर्वविशेषणरहितमित्यर्थः । एकमेवाद्वितीयं हि तत् – केन किं विशिष्यते
Br.Up. 3.8.8 Bh.
In other words, It (Brahman) is devoid of all attributes, for It is one only without a second; so what is there that can be specified, and through what?

यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णमचक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादम् ।
नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं तदव्ययं यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः
Mund.Up. 1.1.6 (sruti)
(By the higher knowledge) the wise realize everywhere that which cannot be perceived and grasped, which is without source, features, eyes, and ears, which has neither hands nor feet, which is eternal, multiformed, allpervasive, extremely subtle, and undiminishing and which is the source of all.

आथात आदेशो नेति नेति न ह्येतस्मादिति नेत्यन्यत्परमस्त्यथ
Br.Up. 2.3.6 (sruti)
Now therefore the description (of Brahman): 'Not this, not this.' Because there is no other and more appropriate description than this 'Not this.'

ननु महता यत्नेन परिकरबन्धं कृत्वा किं युक्तम् एवं निर्देष्टुं ब्रह्म ? बाढम् कस्मात् ? न हि – यस्मात् , 'इति न, इति नऽ इत्येतस्मात् – इतीति व्याप्तव्यप्रकारा नकारद्वयविषया निर्दिश्यन्ते, यथा ग्रामो ग्रामो रमणीय इति – अन्यत्परं निर्देशनं नास्ति ; तस्मादयमेव निर्देशो ब्रह्मणः
Br.Up. 2.3.6 Bh.
Objection: Is it proper to describe Brahman thus after girding up the loins with great effort?
Reply: Yes.
(Opponent): Why?

Reply: Because there is no other instruction (about Brahman) more appropriate than 'Not this, not this' therefore this alone is the description of Brahman. The particle iti occurring twice includes all possible specifications which are to be eliminated by the two negative particles just as by the repeated expression, 'Village after village is beautiful', (all the villages are covered).

Section 41

References:

अथवा 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) इति वीप्सा इयम् – 'इतिऽ इति यावत्किञ्चित् उत्प्रेक्ष्यते, तत्सर्वं न भवतीत्यर्थः – परिगणितप्रतिषेधे हि क्रियमाणे, यदि नैतद्ब्रह्म, किमन्यद्ब्रह्म भवेदिति जिज्ञासा स्यात् ; वीप्सायां तु सत्यां समस्तस्य विषयजातस्य प्रतिषेधात् अविषयः प्रत्यगात्मा ब्रह्मेति, जिज्ञासा निवर्तते

BSBh. 3.2.22

Or again the meaning is, that in as much as 'not so, not so', is tautologous [a repetition], everything whatsoever that is thought of (as existent) does not exist in the real sense. Were the repudiation to be limited to a definite number of phenomenal entities [just corporeal and incorporeal]. One would be curious to know, as to what

other phenomenal entity, possibly, could be Brahman, if these phenomenal entities are not Brahman. The tautologous statement being there, and as all objects as such, are repudiated by it, It becomes established that Brahman is not of the nature of a phenomenal object, but that it is the Universal Self and thus in this manner curiosity is satisfied.

न हि एतस्माद् ब्रह्मणो व्यतिरिक्तम् अस्तीत्यतः 'नेति नेति' इत्युच्यते न पुनः स्वयमेव नास्ति - इत्यर्थः

BSBh. 3.2.22

The meaning is, that there is nothing besides this Brahman and hence it is described as 'not so, not so', and it does not mean that Brahman itself is non-existent.

'वेदा अवेदाः' (ब्रह्।४।३।२२) इति वचनात्

इष्यत एव अस्माभिः श्रुतेरप्यभावः प्रबोधे

BSBh. 4.1.3

Go on to say in the end, that "The Vedas cease to be the Vedas" (Br.Up. 4.3.22). And thus after the realization (of Brahman) we do welcome, even the Vedas ceasing to be the Vedas.

ननु महता परिकरबन्धेन कण्ठरवेण उद्घुष्य ‘ज्ञेयं प्रवक्ष्यामि’ इति, अननुरूपमुक्तं ‘न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते’ इति।

न, अनुरूपमेव उक्तम्। कथम्? सर्वासु हि उपनिषत्सु ज्ञेयं ब्रह्म ‘नेति नेति’ (ब्र।उप्। २।३।६) ‘अस्थूलमनणु’ (ब्र।उप्। ३।८।८) इत्यादिविशेषप्रतिषेधेनैव निर्दिश्यते, न ‘इदं तत्’ इति, वाचः अगोचरत्वात्

BGh. 13.12

Objection: After proclaiming very loudly that He is going to speak of the Knowable, it does not become the Lord to describe It as neither 'sat' nor 'asat.'

Answer: No; it is quite the right thing that has been said. How? Thus: being inaccessible to speech, Brahman, the Knowable, is defined in all Upanishads only by a denial of all specialties, ‘Not thus’ (Br. Up. 2.3.6) and ‘not gross, not subtle’ (Br.Up. 3.8.8) in the terms "It is not this."

Section 42

References:

उपाधिकृतं मिथ्यारूपमपि अस्तित्वाधिगमाय ज्ञेयधर्मवत् परिकल्प्य उच्यते ‘सर्वतःपाणिपादम्’ इत्यादि । तथा हि सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम् - ‘अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते’ (?) इति

BGh. 13.13

Although the unreal form is caused by the limiting adjuncts, still, for the comprehension of Its existence it is said, '(It) has hands and feet everywhere', etc., by assuming this as a quality of the Knowable. Thus, as is well known, there is a saying of the people versed in tradition, 'The Transcendental is described with the help of superimposition (adhyāropa) and its refutation (apavāda)'.

प्रागेकत्वविज्ञानादाचार्यागमसंस्कृतेन मनसैव इदं ब्रह्मैकरसम् आप्तव्यम् आत्मैव नान्यदस्तीति । आप्ते च नानात्वप्रत्युपस्थापिकाया अविद्याया निवृत्तत्वात् इह ब्रह्मणि नाना नास्ति किञ्चन अणुमात्रमपि

Kath.Up. 2.1.11

Before attaining the knowledge of unity, this Brahman, which is homogeneous, is to be attained, as identical with the Self, there being nothing else existing, through the mind which is purified by the teacher and the scriptures. And since ignorance that presents diversity ceases on this attainment, (therefore), here in Brahman, diversity, even so little does not exist.

अपवादो नाम – यत्र कस्मिंश्चिद्वस्तुनि पूर्वनिविष्टायां मिथ्याबुद्धौ निश्चितायाम् , पश्चादुपजायमाना यथार्था बुद्धिः पूर्वनिविष्टाया मिथ्याबुद्धेः निवर्तिका भवति – यथा देहेन्द्रियसङ्घाते आत्मबुद्धिः,

आत्मन्येव आत्मबुद्ध्या पश्चाद्भाविन्या 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) इत्यनया यथार्थबुद्ध्या निवर्त्यते यथा वा दिग्भ्रान्तिबुद्धिः दिग्याथात्म्यबुद्ध्या निवर्त्यते

BSBh. 3.3.9

Apavāda (negation) occurs, where, with regard to an entity, a false notion (of its being some other entity) having already been definitely and successfully superimposed on it, a correct knowledge of it (that it is the self-same entity), which arises later on, negatives the earlier false notion superimposed on it. Just as, for instance, a notion (entertained by a man) that the aggregate of the body and sense-organs is the Self, disappears when [by] the correct knowledge, that 'the Self' is (in fact) 'the Self' (and the body and sense-organs are not the Self) supervenes at some subsequent later stage, by the scriptural knowledge "That thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7). Or, as for instance, when the confused notion about 'a direction' (of the points of a compass), disappears after the correct knowledge about it (dawns on a person).

Section 43

References:

तथा च लोकेऽनुभवः – शुक्तिका हि रजतवद् अवभासते, एकश्चन्द्रः सद्वितीयवदिति

Even so is our experience in the ordinary world, a mother-of-pearl appears as if it is silver. The moon although one only appears as if she were double.

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

अविवेकिनां विवेकिनां च उपचरिता बुद्धिर्दृष्टेति चेत्

न, अविवेकिनां मिथ्याबुद्धित्वात् , विवेकिनां च संव्यवहारमात्रालम्बनार्थत्वात् – यथा कृष्णो रक्तश्च आकाश इति विवेकिनामपि कदाचित् कृष्णता रक्तता च आकाशस्य संव्यवहारमात्रालम्बनार्थत्वं प्रतिपद्यत इति, न परमार्थतः कृष्णो रक्तो वा आकाशो भवितुमर्हति

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Objection: We sometimes see that thinking as well as ignorant people entertain fanciful notions about things.

Reply: Not so, for ignorant people have false notions, whereas thinking people have notions that relate only to an apparent basis for conventional interaction. For instance, even thinking people sometimes say that the

sky is dark or red, where the darkness or redness of the sky has just the above apparent reality. But because of that the sky can never actually (in Reality) become dark or red.

Section 44

References:

यथा एकप्रभृत्यापरार्धसङ्ख्यास्वरूपपरिज्ञानाय रेखाध्यारोपणं कृत्वा – एकेयं रेखा, दशेयम् , शतेयम् , सहस्रेयम् – इति ग्राहयति, अवगमयति सङ्ख्यास्वरूपं केवलम् , न तु सङ्ख्याया रेखात्मत्वमेव । यथा च अकारादीन्यक्षराणि विजिग्राहयिषुः पत्रमषीरेखादिसंयोगोपायमास्थाय वर्णानां सतत्त्वमावेदयति, न पत्रमष्याद्यात्मतामक्षराणां ग्राहयति । तथा चेह उत्पत्त्याद्यनेकोपायमास्थाय एकं ब्रह्मतत्त्वमावेदितम् । पुनः तत्कल्पितोपायजनितविशेषपरिशोधनार्थं नेति नेतीति तत्त्वोपसंहारः कृतः

Br.Up. 4.4.25 Bh.

Just as, in order to explain the nature of numbers from one up to a hundred thousand billions, a man superimposes them on certain lines (digits), calling one of them one, another ten, another hundred, yet another thousand, and so on, and in so doing he only expounds the nature of numbers but he never says that the numbers are the lines; or just as, in order to teach the

alphabet, he has recourse to a combination of leaf, ink, lines, etc., and through them explains the nature of the letters, but he never says that the letters are the leaf, ink, lines, etc. so also here, in expounding the one principle of Brahman, many means such as origination (of the universe) have been resorted to. Again, to eliminate the differences created by those (hypothetical) means, the truth has been summed up as 'Not this, not this.'

यदा पुनः स्वरूपमेव निर्दिदिक्षितं भवति निरस्तसर्वोपाधिविशेषम् , तदा न शक्यते केनचिदपि प्रकारेण निर्देष्टुम् ; तदा अयमेवाभ्युपायः — यदुत प्राप्तनिर्देशप्रतिषेधद्वारेण 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) इति निर्देशः

Br.Up. 2.3.6 Bh.

When, however, we wish to describe Its true nature, free from all differences due to limiting adjuncts, then it is an utter impossibility. Then there is only one way left, viz. to describe It as 'Not this, not this,' by eliminating all possible specifications of It that one may know of.

Section 45

References:

अतो न निर्देष्टुं शक्यते – इदं तदिति – गौरसौ स्पन्दते शुक्लो विषाणीति यथा लोके निर्दिश्यते, तथा । अध्यारोपितनामरूपकर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म निर्दिश्यते 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २८) 'विज्ञानघन एव ब्रह्मात्माऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । १२) इत्येवमादिशब्दैः

Br.Up. 2.3.6 Bh.

Hence It (Brahman) cannot be described as, 'It is such and such,' as we can describe a cow by saying, 'There moves a white cow with horns.' **Brahman is described by means of name, form and action superimposed on It,** in such terms as, 'Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman' (Br.Up. 3.9 28), and 'Pure Intelligence' (Br.Up. 2.4.12), 'Brahman,' and 'Atman.'

Section 46

No References.

Section 47

References:

शास्त्रीये तु व्यवहारे यद्यपि बुद्धिपूर्वकारी नाविदित्वा आत्मनः परलोकसम्बन्धमधिक्रियते, तथापि न वेदान्तवेद्यमशनायाद्यतीतमपेतब्रह्मक्षत्रादिभेदमसंसार्यात्मतत्त्वमधिकारेऽपेक्ष्यते, अनुपयोगात् अधिकारविरोधाच्च । प्राक् च

तथाभूतात्मविज्ञानात् प्रवर्तमानं शास्त्रमविद्यावद्विषयत्वं नातिवर्तते । तथा हि – 'ब्राह्मणो यजेतऽ इत्यादीनि शास्त्राण्यात्मनि वर्णाश्रमवयोऽवस्थादिविशेषाध्यासमाश्रित्य प्रवर्तन्ते

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

In the case of activities based on the Scriptures (such as sacrifices etc.) though a man motivated by intelligence is not competent to act without the knowledge of the relation of the Self with the world beyond (Para-loka), Yet the knowledge of the Self which can only be acquired from Vedānta, and is beyond the physical necessities of eating etc., and is beyond the distinctions of Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya and which is not of the nature of transmigratory existence, is not necessary for a man for attaining that competency. Because it is useless and even opposed to such competency (for performing religious acts). The Śāstra which comes into operation before the realization of such nature of the Self does not exceed its jurisdiction of being concerned only with that which is affected by ignorance. Thus, **scriptural injunctions such as "a Brāhmaṇa should sacrifice" operate by depending on this superimposition on the Self, of caste, stage of life (Āśrama), age** and special conditions.

Section 48

References:

विद्योपदेशपरा तावच्छ्रुतिः संसारात्पुरुषो मोक्षयितव्य इति संसारहेतोरविद्यायाः विद्यया निवृत्तिः कर्तव्येति विद्याप्रकाशकत्वेन प्रवृत्तेति न विरोधः । एवमपि कर्त्रादिकारकसद्भावप्रतिपादनपरं शास्त्रं विरुध्यत एवेति चेत् । न ; यथाप्राप्तमेव कारकास्तित्वमुपादाय उपात्तदुरितक्षयार्थं कर्माणि विदधच्छास्त्रं मुमुक्षूणां फलार्थिनां च फलसाधनं न कारकास्तित्वे व्याप्रियते। उपचितदुरितप्रतिबन्धस्य हि विद्योत्पत्तिर्नावकल्पते । तत्क्षये च विद्योत्पत्तिः स्यात् , ततश्चाविद्यानिवृत्तिः, तत आत्यन्तिकः संसारोपरमः

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

That being so, the Vedic texts which are devoted to the communication of knowledge engage themselves in the revelation of knowledge under the belief that since a man has to be liberated from the world, ignorance, which is the cause of the world, must be eradicated through knowledge. Hence there is no contradiction.

Objection: Even so, the scriptures establishing the existence of the accessories, viz agent etc., are certainly contradicted.

Answer: No, the scriptures, assuming the hypothetical existence of the accessories, enjoin rites and duties for

the wearing away of the accumulated sins of those who aspire for liberation, and also as a means for the achievement of fruits by those who hanker after results. (But) they do not concern themselves with establishing the reality of those accessories. For, the rise of knowledge cannot be imagined with regard to one who has the hindrance of accumulated sins. On the wearing away of those sins, knowledge will emerge; from that will follow the cessation of ignorance, and from that the absolute cessation of the world.

यच्चोक्तम् स्वार्थविघातकरत्वादप्रामाण्यमिति, तदपि न, तदर्थप्रतिपत्तेर्बाधकाभावात् । न हि उपनिषद्भ्यः – ब्रह्मैकमेवाद्वितीयम् , नैव च – इति प्रतिपत्तिरस्ति – यथा अग्निरुष्णः शीतश्चेत्यस्माद्वाक्यात् विरुद्धार्थद्वयप्रतिपत्तिः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

You have said that the Upaniṣads are no authority since they contradict their obvious import. This is wrong because there is no such contradiction in their meaning. In the first place, the Upaniṣads never give us the idea that Brahman both is and is not one only without a second, as from the sentence that fire is both hot and cold, we get two contradictory meanings.

यच्चोक्तम् – कर्मकाण्डप्रामाण्यविघातकृत् उपनिषद्वाक्यमिति, तन्न, अन्यार्थत्वात् । ब्रह्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनपरा हि उपनिषदः न इष्टार्थप्राप्तौ साधनोपदेशं तस्मिन्वा पुरुषनियोगं वारयन्ति, अनेकार्थत्वानुपपत्तेरेव

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

You have said that passages of the Upaniṣads clash with the authority of the ritualistic portion of the Vedas. This is not correct, because they have a different meaning. The Upaniṣads establish the unity of Brahman; they do not negate instructions regarding the means to the attainment of some desired object, or prevent persons from undertaking it, for, as already said, a passage cannot have more than one meaning.

अपि च यथाप्राप्तस्यैव अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्य क्रियाकारकफलस्य आश्रयणेन इष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायसामान्ये प्रवृत्तस्य तद्विशेषमजानतः तदाचक्षाणा श्रुतिः क्रियाकारकफलभेदस्य लोकप्रसिद्धस्य सत्यताम् असत्यतां वा न आचष्टे न च वारयति, इष्टानिष्टफलप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायविधिपरत्वात्

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Moreover, **actions, their factors and their results are things we naturally believe in, they are the creation of ignorance.** When through their help a man who desires to gain something good or to avoid something evil,

proceeds to adopt a means of which he has only a vague, not definite idea, the Śruti simply tells him about that; it says nothing either for or against the truth of the diversity of actions, their factors and their results, which people have already taken for granted. For the Śruti only prescribes means for the attainment of desired ends and the avoidance of untoward results.

अथैवं सति तदौदासीन्यस्वरूपावस्थाने फले प्राप्ते शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं प्रति अर्थित्वं निवर्तते ;

तथा प्रतिपुरुषं परिसमाप्तं शास्त्रम् इति न शास्त्रविरोधगन्धोऽपि अस्ति, अद्वैतज्ञानावसानत्वात् शास्त्रशिष्यशासनादिद्वैतभेदस्य

Br.Up. 5.1.1 Bh.

So when they have attained that result–their real state of aloofness, their interest in the validity of the scriptures ceases. And in the absence of that the scriptures too just cease to be scriptures to them. Hence, the scriptures having similarly fulfilled their mission with regard to every person, there is not the least chance of a conflict with them; for such **dualistic differences as scripture, disciple and discipline terminate with the knowledge of unity.**

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते

Mand.Up. Karika 1.18

The notion (such as the teacher, the taught and the scripture) will disappear, if anyone had imagined it. This notion (of the teacher etc.) is for the purpose of instruction. When (the Truth is) realised, duality does not exist.

ननु शास्ता शास्त्रं शिष्य इत्ययं विकल्पः कथं निवृत्त इति, उच्यते

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत यदि केनचित्कल्पितः स्यात् । यथा अयं प्रपञ्चो मायारज्जुसर्पवत् , तथा अयं शिष्यादिभेदविकल्पोऽपि प्राक्प्रतिबोधादेवोपदेशनिमित्तः

Mand.Up. Karika 1.18 Bh.

Objection: How could the notions such as the teacher, the taught and the scripture disappear? This is being explained.

Reply: The notion will disappear (cease) if anybody had imagined it. Just as this world is an illusion like a snake on a rope, so also the **notion of differences such as the taught, (the teacher) etc. is for the sake of instructions to be imparted prior to the realisation (correct understanding)**.

तमेतमविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेय-व्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्ष-पराणि

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

And it is by entertaining i.e., adopting this mutual superimposition of the Self and the non-self, that all worldly conduct and Vedic actions depending on the means-of-proof (pramāṇa) and the objects of knowledge, and all scriptural injunctions and prohibitions, known as ignorance, [as well as Liberation, Mokṣa] are promoted.

Section 49

References:

स्वविषयशूराणि हि प्रमाणानि, श्रोत्रादिवत्

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

For the means of knowledge are powerful in their respective spheres, like the ear etc.

श्रोत्रादिद्वारैः शब्दादिभिः प्रत्यक्षत उपलभ्यमानैः ब्रह्मण एकत्वं विरुध्यत इति वदन्तो वक्तव्याः – किं शब्दादीनां भेदेन आकाशैकत्वं विरुध्यत इति ; अथ न विरुध्यते, न तर्हि प्रत्यक्षविरोधः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

To those who say that sound etc., perceived through the ear and so forth, contradict the unity of Brahman, we put this question: Does the variety of sound and the rest contradict the oneness of the ether? If it does not, then there is no contradiction in our position with perception.

लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम्; आगममात्रसमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत्

BSBh. 2.1.6 Bh.

Nor is it perceptible by inference etc., as there is absence of any indicatory mark about it (i.e., Brahman). Like religious duty, it (i.e., Brahman) is understandable from the Scriptures alone.

परस्मादनन्यत्वेऽपि जीवस्य सर्वव्यवहारलोप-प्रसङ्गः । प्रत्यक्षादि-प्रमाणाप्रवृत्तेरिति चेत् - न, प्राक्प्रबोधात् स्वप्न-व्यवहारवत् तदुपपत्तेः

शास्त्रं च 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति' (ब्र्।उप्। २।४।१४, ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।१५) इत्यादिना। अप्रबुद्धविषये प्रत्यक्षादि-व्यवहारमुक्त्वा पुनः प्रबुद्धविषये - 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्' (ब्र्।उप्। २।४।१४, ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।१५) इत्यादिना तदभावं दर्शयति

BSBh. 4.3.14

Objection: Supposing the Jīva-Self to be non-different from the Highest Self, there would be the predicament of the cessation of all phenomenal activity i.e., practical

existence, because there would be no scope for the operation of such means-of-proof as direct perception etc.

Reply: No, because prior to the realization of Brahman, like the transactions in a dream prior to awakening, the continuance (i.e. the operation of the means-of-proof) would be reasonably sustainable. The Śāstra also, by the passage “For when there is duality as it were then one sees another” (Br.Up. 2.4.14; Br.Up. 4.5.15) etc. Having spoken about the operation of such means-of-proof as direct perception etc. in the case of those who have not realized the truth (i.e. Brahman) again indicates the absence of it (i.e. the operation of such means-of-proof), In the case of those who have realized such truth (i.e. Brahman) by the passage “When every thing has, to him, become but the Self only, by what can he see and whom?” (Br.Up. 2.4.14; Br.Up. 4.5.15).

Section 50

References:

कथं त्वसत्येन वेदान्तवाक्येन सत्यस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वस्य प्रतिपत्तिरुपपद्येत ? न हि रज्जुसर्पेण दष्टो म्रियते ; नापि मृगतृष्णिकाम्भसा पानावगाहनादिप्रयोजनं क्रियत इति ।

नैष दोषः, शङ्काविषादिनिमित्तमरणादिकार्योपलब्धेः,
स्वप्नदर्शनावस्थस्य च सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यदर्शनात् ।
तत्कार्यमप्यनृतमेवेति चेद्ब्रूयात् , अत्र ब्रूमः – यद्यपि
स्वप्नदर्शनावस्थस्य सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यमनृतम् , तथापि
तदवगतिः सत्यमेव फलम् , प्रतिबुद्धस्याप्यबाध्यमानत्वात्

BSBh. 2.1.14

Objection: But how ever can the realization of the unity of Brahman as the Self of all, in fact, arise, through such palpably untrue Vedānta passages? A man who thinks he is bitten, by what in the place of a rope he considers to be a snake, does not die thereby, nor can anybody make use of the water as seen in a mirage, for drinking or bathing etc.

Reply: This is no fault, because we do observe an effect such as death, supervening by reason of even the suspicion of being poisoned (by a snake bite). And it is also seen that a man experiencing a dream sees actions such as that of his being bitten by a snake or of his having a bath.

Objection: Like the dream itself, even that action in a dream (of a snake-bite or of bathing) is untrue.

Reply: Though the action of being bitten by a snake or having a bath, experienced by a person dreaming, is no

doubt untrue, the fruit of that action, viz. his experience of that action, is indeed true enough, because that experience is not eradicated or removed even after such person awakens.

ग्राह्यं जनिमद्बुद्धिविषयमपलपत्यर्थात् 'स एष नेति नेति' (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २६), (बृ। उ। ४ । २ । ४), (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २२), (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यात्मनोऽदृश्यतां दर्शयन्ती श्रुतिः ।

उपायस्योपेयनिष्ठतामजानत उपायत्वेन व्याख्यातस्य उपेयवद्ग्राह्यता मा भूदिति अग्राह्यभावेन हेतुना कारणेन निह्नुत इत्यर्थः । ततश्चैवमुपायस्योपेयनिष्ठतामेव जानत उपेयस्य च नित्यैकरूपत्वमिति तस्य सबाह्याभ्यन्तरमजमात्मतत्त्वं प्रकाशते स्वयमेव

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.26 Bh.

The sruti in such words as, "This Self is that which has been declared as, "Not this, not this'" (Br. Up. 3.9.26), shows the imperceptibility of the Self and refutes (indirectly) everything that is perceptible as it has origination, and is grasped by the intellect. With a view to showing that those who do not know that the means (intended for realisation of the Self) leads only to one goal (viz Self realisation), should not commit the error by thinking that the means has the same reality as the end itself, the sruti negates the reality of the means by citing the incomprehensibility of the Self as a reason. This is

the meaning. Then, to one who knows that the means serves the purpose of attaining the end and that the end is ever of the same unchanging nature, the reality of the Self that exists both within and without and is unborn, becomes revealed by Itself.

Section 51

References:

न हि आत्मस्वरूपाधिगमे सति पुनः प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः सम्भवति ।

प्रमातृत्वं हि आत्मनः निवर्तयति अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् ; निवर्तयदेव च अप्रमाणीभवति, स्वप्नकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे । लोके च वस्त्वधिगमे प्रवृत्तिहेतुत्त्वादर्शनात् प्रमाणस्य

BGh. 2.69

When all about the Self (Atman) becomes known the factors such as authority, the object to be realised, etc. are not possible. The final authority (antyaṃ pramāṇam) denies percipience (of a "knower") to the Atman. With the denial it ceases to be an authority even as the dream ceases to govern (the mind of) the one who is awake. And in common parlance, when a thing is known already, no other valid proof is sought for in its support.

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणमात्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकम् – नातःपरं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति ; यथा हि लोके यजेतेत्युक्ते, किं केन कथम् इत्याकाङ्क्ष्यते ; नैवं ‘ तत्त्वमसिऽ ‘ अहं ब्रह्मास्मिऽ इत्युक्ते, किञ्चिदन्यदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति – सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वावगतेः ; सति ह्यन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणेऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात् ; न त्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति, य आकाङ्क्ष्येत

न चेयमवगतिर्नोत्पद्यत इति शक्यं वक्तुम् , ‘ तद्धास्य विजज्ञौऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १६ । ३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः, अवगतिसाधनानां च श्रवणादीनां वेदानुवचनादीनां च विधीयमानत्वात् । न चेयमवगतिरनर्थिका भ्रान्तिर्वेति शक्यं वक्तुम् ; अविद्यानिवृत्तिफलदर्शनात् , बाधकज्ञानान्तराभावाच्च

BSBh. 2.1.14

Now what is more is, that this is the final conclusive means-of-proof which declares the oneness of Self, and there is nothing further which is desired to be known.

Just as in the ordinary world, when an injunction to perform a sacrifice is given, it is necessary to know with what (material) and how one should perform the sacrifice,

But when it is said “That thou art” or “I am Brahman” and one understands how the Ātmā i.e. Brahman is the Self of all, there is nothing which need be known beyond that. For it is only when there still remains something which ought to be known, that there can be any further

desire to know. And as apart from one's unity with the Self nothing still remains which one would further want to know. It is not possible to say that such realization cannot arise for a scriptural passage says – "He (i.e. Śveta-ketu) understood that (viz. the oneness of Self) from him (i.e. his father)" (Chan.Up. 6.16.3), and there is besides instruction (in Scriptures) about listening to the scriptures and reciting them, as the means of such realization. Nor is it possible to say that such realization is meaningless or is a delusion because it is seen that it has the result of removing ignorance, and there is absence of any other knowledge, which would invalidate it.

Section 52

References:

एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यमेतदप्रमयं ध्रुवम् ।

विरजः पर आकाशादज आत्मा महान्ध्रुवः

Br.Up. 4.4.20 (sruti)

It should be realised in one form only, (for) It is unknowable and eternal. The Self is taintless, beyond the (subtle) ether, birthless, infinite and constant.

अन्तवन्त इमे देहा नित्यस्योक्ताः शरीरिणः ।

अनाशिनोऽप्रमेयस्य तस्माद्युध्यस्व भारत

BG 2.18 (smriti)

These bodies of the embodied (Self) who is eternal, indestructible and unknowable, are said to have an end. Do fight therefore O descendant of Bharata.

न, आत्मनः स्वतः-सिद्धत्वात्। सिद्धे हय् आत्मनि प्रमातरि प्रमित्सोः प्रमाणान्वेषणा भवति । न हि पूर्वम् 'इत्थम् [प्रमाता] अहम्' इति आत्मानम् अप्रमाय पश्चात् प्रमेय-परिच्छेदाय प्रवर्तते। न हय् आत्मा नाम कस्यचिद् अप्रसिद्धो भवति

BGh. 2.18

No, because the Self is self-evident. For, (only) when the Self stands predetermined as the knower, there is a search for a means of knowledge by the knower. Indeed, it is not that without first determining oneself as, 'I am such', one takes up the task of determining an object of knowledge. For what is called the 'self' does not remain unknown to anyone.

Section 53

References:

न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति । किं तर्हि? प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदम् अपनयति

BSBh. 1.1.4

And it does not purport to propound Brahman as being an object objectively, thus – This is Brahman. What then does it propound? It propounds Brahman as not being an object (of sense), but as being the Universal Self

And thereby removes the distinction between objects to be known, the knower, and the act of knowing etc., as imagined through ignorance.

ननु आगमेन आत्मा परिच्छिद्यते, प्रत्यक्षादिना च पूर्वम् । न ; आत्मनः स्वतःसिद्धत्वात् । सिद्धे हि आत्मनि प्रमातरि प्रमित्सोः प्रमाणान्वेषणा भवति । न हि पूर्वम् 'इत्थमहम्' इति आत्मानमप्रमाय पश्चात् प्रमेयपरिच्छेदाय प्रवर्तते । न हि आत्मा नाम कस्यचित् अप्रसिद्धो भवति । शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् अतद्धर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रमाणत्वम् आत्मनः प्रतिपद्यते, न तु अज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन । तथा च श्रुतिः – 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ। उ। ३ । ४ । १) इति

BGh. 2.18

Objection: The Self is measured or determined by revelation, and, earlier, by perception and so forth.

Answer: No; **for the Self is self-established**. Indeed, it is only when the knower, the Self, is given, that there arises the search for the means of right cognition on the part of the seeker after knowledge. Without knowing the Self earlier as "such and such am I", none attempts to secure determinate knowledge of the object of knowledge. To none at all is the Self altogether unknown (na hi ātmā nāma kasyacid aprasiddhaḥ bhavati). The final means of right cognition, the sastra or scripture, acquires validity as regards the Self by setting aside the nonattributes of the Self superimposed on It, and not by revealing what was altogether unknown. Thus, the sruti declares: "That which is immediately present is Brahman, the Self in all" (Br.Up. 3.4.1).

न ह्यात्मागन्तुकः कस्यचित् , स्वयंसिद्धत्वात् ; न ह्यात्मा आत्मनः प्रमाणमपेक्ष्य सिध्यति ; तस्य हि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणान्यसिद्धप्रमेयसिद्धये उपादीयन्ते ; न ह्याकाशादयः पदार्थाः प्रमाणनिरपेक्षाः स्वयं सिद्धाः केनचिदभ्युपगम्यन्ते ; आत्मा तु प्रमाणादिव्यवहाराश्रयत्वात्प्रागेव प्रमाणादिव्यवहारात्सिध्यति ; न चेदृशस्य निराकरणं सम्भवति ; आगन्तुकं हि वस्तु निराक्रियते, न स्वरूपम् ; य एव हि निराकर्ता तदेव तस्य स्वरूपम् ; न ह्यग्नेरौष्ण्यमग्निना निराक्रियते

BSBh. 2.3.7

So far as any person is concerned, the Self (Ātmā) cannot be adventitious (Āgantuka), because its existence is self-established (i.e. it proves itself). This self-establishment of the existence of the Self does not depend upon any means-of-proof, but, on the other hand, it is the Self (of every person) that utilizes such means-of-proof as direct perception etc., for the establishment of the existence of entities which are yet to be established. Nobody understands that entities such as the Ākāśa etc. are independent of any means-of-proof and that their existence is self-established. The Self, on the other hand, being the substratum or basis for the employment of the means-of-proof, Its existence is supposed to be fully established, prior to such employment of the means-of-proof. Refutation of such an one, is not possible. It is an **adventitious entity that can be denied, and never one's own nature.** Because he who would seek to be such a repudiator (negator), would, being the Self (Ātmā) himself, be the Self's own nature. Fire (Agni) cannot possibly deny its own heat.

'सिद्धं तु निवर्तकत्वात्' इत्यागमविदां सूत्रम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.32 Bh.

There is the following aphoristic statement by the knowers of the Āgama. “The validity of Scripture is established by its negating all positive characteristics of Atman.

Section 54

References:

येषां पुनस्तमोपनयनव्यतिरेकेण घटाधिगमे प्रमाणं व्याप्रियते, तेषां छेद्यावयवसम्बन्धवियोगव्यतिरेकेण अन्यतरावयवेऽपि च्छिदिर्व्याप्रियत इत्युक्तं स्यात् । यदा पुनर्घटतमसोर्विवेककरणे प्रवृत्तं प्रमाणमनुपादित्सिततमोनिवृत्तिफलावसानं छिदिरिव च्छेद्यावयवसम्बन्धविवेककरणे प्रवृत्ता तदवयवद्वैधीभावफलावसाना, तदा नान्तरीयकं घटविज्ञानं न प्रमाणफलम्

Ma.Up. 7 Bh.

But those who say that the knowledge, in addition to the removal of the darkness (that envelopes the jar), enables one to know the jar, may as well affirm that the act of cutting (a tree), in addition to its undoing the relation of the members of the body intended to be cut, also functions (in other ways) in other parts of the body. As the act of cutting intended to divide the tree into two is said to be complete with the severance of the parts (of the tree) so also the knowledge employed to perceive the

jar covered by the darkness (that envelopes it) attains its purpose when it results in removing the darkness, though that is not the object intended to be produced. In such case the knowledge of the jar, which is invariably connected with the removal of the darkness, is not the result accomplished by the instrument of knowledge.

Section 55

References:

ननु विप्रतिषिद्धं ज्ञायते यः श्रवणादिकर्तृत्वेन अमतो मन्ता अविज्ञातो विज्ञाता इति च । तथा 'न मतेर्मन्तारं मन्वीथा न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः' (बृ। उ। ३ । ४ । २) इत्यादि च

Ait.Up. 2 Upod Bh.

Vedantin: Is it not contradictory to say of him, who is known through the act of hearing etc., that `He thinks without being thought of, he knows without being known' and that `You cannot think of that which is the thinker of thought; you cannot know that which is the knower of knowledge' (Br.Up. 3.4.2) etc.?

न, अवगतेरेव आत्मनि सद्भावादिति परिहृतमेतत्। प्रमातुश्चेत् प्रमाणापेक्षा सिद्धिः कस्य प्रमित्सा स्यात्। यस्य प्रमित्सा स एव

प्रमाता अभ्युपगम्यते। तदीया च प्रमित्सा प्रमेयविषयैव, न प्रमातृविषया, प्रमातृविषयत्वे अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् प्रमातुः तदिच्छायाश्च तस्याप्यन्यः प्रमाता तस्याप्यन्य इति, एवमेव इच्छायाः प्रमातृविषयत्वे। प्रमातुः आत्मनः अव्यवहितत्वाच्च प्रमेयत्वानुपपत्तिः। लोके हि प्रमेयं नाम प्रमातुः इच्छास्मृतिप्रयत्नप्रमाणजन्मव्यवहितं सिध्यति, नान्यथास्: अवगतिः प्रमेयविषया दृष्टा। न च प्रमातुः प्रमाता स्वस्य स्वयमेव केनचित् व्यवहितः कल्पयितुं शक्यः इच्छादीनामन्यतमेनापि। स्मृतिश्च स्मर्तव्यविषया, न स्मर्तृविषया। तथाइच्छायाः इष्टविषयत्वमेव, न इच्छावद्विषयत्वम्। स्मर्त्रिच्छावद्विषयत्वेऽपि हि उभयोः अनवस्था पूर्ववत् अपरिहार्या स्यात्

UPS Prose 2.99

Whom will the desire (to know a thing) belong to, if the Knower depend on evidence in order to be known? It is admitted that one who is desirous of knowing a thing is the knower. His desire of knowing a thing has for its object the thing to be known and not the knower. For, in the latter case, there arises a regresses ad infinitum with regard to the knower and also with regard to the desire to know the knower, inasmuch as the knower of the knower and so on (are to be known). Moreover, there being nothing intervening, the knower, the Self, cannot fall into the category of the known. For a thing to be known, becomes known, when it is distanced from the knower by the birth of an intervening desire, memory, effort or

evidence on the part of the knower. There cannot be the knowledge of an object in any other way. Again it cannot be imagined that the knower himself is distanced by anyone of his own desire etc. For memory has for its object the thing to be remembered and not one who remembers it; so has desire for its object the thing to be desired and not one who desires it. There arises, as before, an inevitable regresses ad infinitum if memory and desire have their own agents for their objects.

सर्वस्य योऽयं मन्ता, स मन्तैवेति न स मन्तव्यः स्यात् । न च द्वितीयो मन्तुर्मन्तास्ति । यदा स आत्मनैव मन्तव्यः, तदा येन च मन्तव्य आत्मा आत्मना, यश्च मन्तव्य आत्मा, तौ द्वौ प्रसज्येयाताम् । एक एव आत्मा द्विधा मन्तृमन्तव्यत्वेन द्विशकलीभवेद्वंशादिवत् , उभयथाप्यनुपपत्तिरेव ।

यथा प्रदीपयोः प्रकाश्यप्रकाशकत्वानुपपत्तिः, समत्वात् , तद्वत् । न च मन्तुर्मन्तव्ये मननव्यापारशून्यः कालेऽस्त्यात्ममननाय ।

यदापि लिङ्गेनात्मानं मनुते मन्ता, तदापि पूर्ववदेव लिङ्गेन मन्तव्य आत्मा, यश्च तस्य मन्ता, तौ द्वौ प्रसज्येयाताम् ; एक एव वा द्विधेति पूर्वोक्तो दोषः

Ait.Up. 2. Upod. Bh.

He who is the thinker of all will simply be the thinker, and he will not be an object of thought. And there is not a second thinker who can think of that thinker. Should he

be thinkable by the Self, then there will be the contingency (of the existence) of two Selves the one being the Self by which the (thinking) Self is thought of and the other Self which is thought of. Or, the same Self will be split into two halves, like a bamboo, to become the thinker and the thinkable. But it is illogcial either way. This is analogous to the case of two lamps which, because of their similarity, cannot be (mutually) the illuminator and the illumined. Besides, the thinker, while engaged in thinking of the thinkable object, has no time left out from the process of thinking during which to think of himself [The mind engages not in the Self but in things external to it]. Even on the supposition that the thinker thinks of the Self through the grounds of inference, there will spring up two Selves the one that is inferred through logical grounds, and the other that infers. Or the same Self will be split up. And so there will be the defect already mentioned.

Section 56

References:

सिद्धे हि आत्मनि प्रमातरि प्रमित्सोः प्रमाणान्वेषणा भवति

BGh. 2.18

Indeed, it is only when the knower, the Self, is given, that there arises the search for the means of right cognition on the part of the seeker after knowledge

देहेन्द्रियादिषु अहंममाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तौ प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

Because in the case of a person who has no such false sense of 'I' or 'Mine' with regard to the body and the sense-organs, there is no possibility of his being desirous of knowledge, as there is no possibility of the operation of the means of right knowledge.

य आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः स सर्वांश्च लोकानाप्नोति सर्वांश्च कामान्यस्तमात्मानमनुविद्य विजानातीति ह प्रजापतिरुवाच

Ch.Up. 8.7.1 (sruti)

The Atman which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger and

thirst, whose desire is of the truth, whose resolve is of the truth, he should be sought, him one should desire to understand. He who has found out and who understands that Atman attains all the worlds and all the desires. Thus spoke Prajapati.

विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयादित्युक्तानुशासनासि मैत्रेय्येतावदरे खल्वमृतत्वमिति होक्त्वा याज्ञवल्क्यो विजहार

Br.Up. 4.5.15 (sruti)

Through what, O Maitreyī, should one know the Knower? So, you have got the instruction, Maitreyī. This much indeed is (the means of) immortality, my dear. Saying this Yājñavalkya left.

अन्वेष्टव्यात्मविज्ञानात् प्राक्प्रमातृत्वमात्मनः । अन्विष्टः स्यात्प्रमातैव पाप्मदोषादिवर्जितः

BSBh. 1.1.4

As long as the knowledge of the Self, which the Scriptures want us to endeavour after, has not arisen, so long, the Self is a knowing agent. But the same knowing agent becomes that which is searched after, viz. the Highest Self, which is free from all evil and blemish, when the real nature of the Self is realized.

यावद्धि न सत्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तिः । तावत्प्रमाणप्रमेयफललक्षणेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते । विकारानेव तु 'अहम्' 'मम' इत्यविद्यया आत्मात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते स्वाभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा । तस्मात्प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः । यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान्भावान्पश्यतो निश्चितमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राक्प्रबोधात् । न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति, तद्वत्

BSBh. 2.1.14

As long as the truth of the one-ness of the Self is not realized, the knowledge, that all these effects, i.e. modifications, as characterized by the means-of-proof, the thing to be known, and the fruit, are unreal, does not arise in any one, and on the other hand, people in general under the influence of ignorance, consider these effects or modifications as being their own Selfs, viz., that this body is myself, or that this is mine, by ignoring their own Brahmic (true) nature. Therefore, prior to the realization of Brahman as the Self of all, all worldly and religious transactions based on the Scriptures, are reasonably sustainable i.e., valid. Even as an ordinary man, while he is asleep and dreaming, sees all the high and low entities, and definitely considers his experiences quite as real as they are when they are directly

perceived, and has no notion, then, of their having only an unreal appearance (of direct perception).

प्रतिलोममिदं सर्वं यथोक्तं लोकबुद्धितः ।

अविवेकधियामस्ति नास्ति सर्वं विवेकिनाम्

UPS Metrical 18.95

All this, which has been set forth according to popular conviction, is inverted [thinking]. [Though] for those who are not intent upon discrimination, everything exists, [yet] it does not exist for those who have discriminating knowledge.

Section 57

References:

आगममात्रसमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत्

BSBh. 2.1.6

Like religious duty, it (i.e. Brahman) is understandable from the Scriptures alone.

तत्र पण्डितम्मन्याः केचित् स्वचित्तवशात् सर्वं प्रमाणमितरेतरविरुद्धं मन्यन्ते, तथा प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधमपि चोदयन्ति ब्रह्मैकत्वे

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Nevertheless certain selfstyled wise men (the logicians), following their own whims, think that the different means of knowledge are mutually contradictory, and also level against us the objection that if Brahman be the only reality, such Upaniṣadic texts contradict perception.

तथा च श्रुतिः – ‘ नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठऽ (क। उ। १ । २ । ९) इति ; ‘ को अद्धा वेद क इह प्रवोचत्ऽ ‘ इयं विसृष्टिर्यत आबभूवऽ (ऋ। सं। १ । ३० । ६) इति चैते ऋचौ सिद्धानामपीश्वराणां दुर्बोधतां जगत्कारणस्य दर्शयतः ; स्मृतिरपि भवति – ‘ अचिन्त्याः खलु ये भावा न तांस्तर्केण योजयेत्ऽ इति, ‘ अव्यक्तोऽयमचिन्त्योऽयमविकार्योऽयमुच्यतेऽ (भ। गी। २ । २५) इति च, ‘ न मे विदुः सुरगणाः प्रभवं न महर्षयः । अहमादिर्हि देवानां महर्षीणां च सर्वशःऽ (भ। गी। १० । २) इति चैवंजातीयका

BSBh. 2.1.6

So say the scriptures also – “This knowledge cannot be acquired by reasoning. Oh, dear one, it becomes properly understood only when it is taught by another (competent person).” (Kath.Up .1.2.9), “Who indeed knows whence came this creation”, and “From what did it originate” (Ṛg. Sam. 1.30.6). These Vedic Ṛks show how difficult it is

even for Gods who have acquired super-human powers, to understand this cause of the world. The Smṛti also says – "These entities are inscrutable, and one should not try to understand them by reasoning." Smṛtis also are of the same type, thus: – "He is said to be unmanifest or unevolved, inscrutable and unchangeable" (BG.2.25). "Not even these hosts of Gods know my origin, as I myself am the comprehensive origin of the Gods and Ṛṣis" (BG.10.2).

Section 58

References:

सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु , तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्याय अनुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवत् , न निवार्यते, श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् । तथा हि – 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । ५) इति श्रुतिः 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसम्पद्येतैवमेवेहाचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेदऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १४ । २) इति च पुरुषबुद्धिसाहाय्यमात्मनो दर्शयति

BSBh. 1.1.2

Such Vedānta passages dealing with the cause of the creation etc. of the transitory world being there (for that purpose),

Inference also, which is not antagonistic (to such passages) and furnishes a means of right knowledge, for the strengthening of the understanding of the meaning of these passages, is not rejected**. Because the Scriptures themselves accept the aid of Logic as an auxiliary**. For Scriptural passages such as “The Self is to be heard and cogitated upon” (Br.Up. 2.4.5), And “A learned and intelligent person does of course reach Gāndhāra, and similarly, a man who has a teacher acquires knowledge (of Brahman)” (Chan.Up. 6.14.2), show that a man’s intelligence is helpful to the Scriptures.

यस्मान्निरागमाः पुरुषोत्प्रेक्षामात्रनिबन्धनास्तर्का अप्रतिष्ठिता भवन्ति

BSBh. 2.1.11

Because reasonings which are not derived from Scriptural traditions and which depend solely on the speculations of man, happen to be inconclusive…

यद्यपि क्वचिद्विषये तर्कस्य प्रतिष्ठितत्वमुपलक्ष्यते । तथापि प्रकृते तावद्विषये प्रसज्यत एवाप्रतिष्ठितत्वदोषादनिर्मोक्षस्तर्कस्य । न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनमागममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम्

BSBh. 2.1.11

Even though with regard to some particular subject, reasoning is seen to have a firm basis i.e. it is conclusive. Still so far as the present subject is concerned, the objection that reasoning cannot escape the fault of having no firm basis and being inconclusive, does apply all the same. Barring traditional instruction of the Vedas, it is not possible even to indulge in any conjecture about the very deep nature and positive existence of an entity (Brahman) as such, on which liberation depends.

यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम् । नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः सम्भवति । श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते

BSBh. 2.1.6

With regard to the objection, viz. that it has been said that as the Scriptures enjoin cogitation in addition to the hearing of it, it shows that they welcome reasoning also with due respect

Reply: Mere empty reasoning cannot justify its own help (to the understanding of Brahman) on some such pretext. **It is only such reasoning as is in consonance with the Scriptures (śruti anugṛhīta tarkaḥ) that can be resorted to as a subordinate auxiliary to experience.**

Section 59

References:

अपि च सम्यग्ज्ञानान्मोक्ष इति सर्वेषां मोक्षवादिनामभ्युपगमः ; तच्च सम्यग्ज्ञानमेकरूपम् , वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात् ; एकरूपेण ह्यवस्थितो योऽर्थः स परमार्थः ; लोके तद्विषयं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानमित्युच्यते – यथाग्निरुष्ण इति ; तत्रैवं सति सम्यग्ज्ञाने पुरुषाणां विप्रतिपत्तिरनुपपन्ना ; तर्कज्ञानानां त्वन्योन्यविरोधात्प्रसिद्धा विप्रतिपत्तिः ; यद्धि केनचित्तार्किकेणेदमेव सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिष्ठापितम् , तदपरेण व्युत्थाप्यते ; तेनापि प्रतिष्ठापितं ततोऽपरेण व्युत्थाप्यत इति च प्रसिद्धं लोके ; कथमेकरूपानवस्थितविषयं तर्कप्रभवं सम्यग्ज्ञानं भवेत् ; न च प्रधानवादी तर्कविदामुत्तम इति सर्वैस्तार्किकैः परिगृहीतः, येन तदीयं मतं सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिपद्येमहि ; न च शक्यन्तेऽतीतानागतवर्तमानास्तार्किका एकस्मिन्देशे काले च समाहर्तुम् , येन तन्मतिरेकरूपैकार्थविषया सम्यङ्मतिरिति स्यात् ; वेदस्य तु नित्यत्वे विज्ञानोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वे च सति व्यवस्थितार्थविषयत्वोपपत्तेः, तज्जनितस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यक्त्वमतीतानागतवर्तमानैः सर्वैरपि तार्किकैरपह्नोतुमशक्यम् . अतः सिद्धमस्यैवौपनिषदस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानत्वम्

BSBh. 2.1.11

Besides all those who believe in liberation, understand, that perfect knowledge (of Brahman) results in liberation. That **perfect knowledge, which is dependent on the thing-in-itself (samyagjñānamekarūpam, vastutantratvāt),**

is of a uniform nature. That entity which exists uniformly is the highest entity. In the ordinary world, knowledge about it is understood to be perfect knowledge, as for instance the knowledge that 'fire is hot'. It being so, it would not be reasonably sustainable to understand that men can have differences about perfect knowledge. Mutual differences amongst men, about knowledges as a result of reasoning, are notorious. That, whatever is expounded by cne logician as perfect knowledge, is upset by another, and that established by him, is upset by yet a third, is well-known in the ordinary world. How ever, then, can knowledge arrived at by reasoning, which is not of one settled aspect, be correct knowledge? It is not as if a follower of the doctrine of the Pradhāna is accepted by all logicians as the best amongst the professors of logic, so that we can understand that, that which is understood by him to be correct knowledge, is in fact so. It is not possible to get together all the past, present and future logicians at one time and in one place, so that the uniform nature of their knowledge about an entity, could be correct knowledge. The Scriptures on the other hand being eternal and being the cause of the attainment of knowledge, it would be reasonably sustainable to understand them to have the ability to possess well-

established knowledge of an entity, so that, it is not possible for the whole lot of past and future logicians to deny the correctness of the knowledge arising from them (i.e. the Scriptures). Hence, the correctness of the Upanishadic knowledge alone is firmly established.

श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते

BSBh. 2.1.6

It is only such reasoning as is in consonance with the Scriptures that can be resorted to as a subordinate auxiliary to experience.

पर एवात्मा यः पूर्वम् 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै। उ। २ । १ । १) इति प्रकृतः ; यस्मादात्मनः स्वप्नमायादिवदाकाशादिक्रमेण रसादयः कोशलक्षणाः सङ्घाता आत्ममायाविसर्जिता इत्युक्तम् । स आत्मा अस्माभिः यथा खं तथेति सम्प्रकाशितः, 'आत्मा ह्याकाशवत्' (मा। का। ३ । ३) इत्यादिश्लोकैः । न तार्किकपरिकल्पितात्मवत्पुरुषबुद्धिप्रमाणगम्य इत्यभिप्रायः

Mand.Up.Ka. 3.11 Bh.

It is the supreme Self alone that was described earlier as "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. Upa. 2.1). From the Self, like dream or magic sprang up in succession ether etc., through the Maya of the Self. Then

(arose) the aggregates of the body in the form of the sheath beginning with that made of food. That Self has been described by us as similar to ether in such verses as, "Self is said to be existing in the form of Jivas just as (the infinite) ether ....” etc. (Mandukya Up. Karika 3.3). The drift is **that the Self cannot be established by the human intellect as is imagined by the logicians.**

शास्त्रोपपत्तिभ्यामवधारितत्वाददद्वयात्मदर्शनं सम्यग्दर्शनम् ,
तद्बाह्यत्वान्मिथ्यादर्शनमन्यत्

Mand.Up.Ka. 3.17 Bh.

The perception (understanding) of the non-dual Self is the right perception (understanding), inasmuch as it is the settled fact of the scriptures and is also determined through reasoning (śāstra-upapattibhyām), and any other view, being outside the pale of the scriptures and reasoning, is false.

कापिलकाणादादितर्कशास्त्रविरोध इति चेत्

न ; तेषां मूलाभावे वेदविरोधे च भ्रान्तत्वोपपत्तेः

Tai.Up. 3.10.3-4 Bh.

Objection: This runs counter to the (Samkhya) scripture promulgated by Kapila, and to the science of logic built up by Kanada and others.

Answer: No so; for if they have no (logical) basis or if they are opposed to the Vedas, it is reasonable to call them erroneous.

ते तु कुतर्कदूषितान्तःकरणाः ब्राह्मणादिवर्णापशदाः अनुकम्पनीयाः आगमार्थविच्छिन्नसम्प्रदायबुद्धय इति

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

that they are the scum of the Brāhmaṇa and other castes, who, with their minds poisoned by illogical reasoning, hold views about the meaning of the Vedas that are divorced from tradition, and are therefore to be pitied.

Section 60

References:

एतेन सर्वाणि तर्कस्मरणानि प्रतिवक्तव्यानि । तान्यपि तर्कोपपत्तिभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानायोपकुर्वन्तीति चेत्, उपकुर्वन्तु नाम । तत्त्वज्ञानं तु वेदान्तवाक्येभ्य एव भवति - 'नावेदविन्मनुते तं बृहन्तम्' (तै। ब्रा। ३-१२-९-७) । 'तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।९।२६) इत्येवमादिश्रुतिभ्यः

BSBh. 2.1.3

By this (refutation), all Smṛtis based on reasoning should be refuted. If it be said, that they also are helpful for the

attainment of knowledge, by means of inferences by reasoning, well may they indeed be so helpful. But the knowledge of truth can only be attained by Scriptural passages, such as “No one who does not know the Vedas, knows the great one” (Tait. Brā. 3.12.9.7), And “I am asking you about the Puruṣa of the Upaniṣads”. (Br.Up. 3.9.26).

येन त्वंशेन न विरुध्येते, तेनेष्टमेव सांख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम्

BSBh. 2.1.3

So far as that portion of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga Smṛtis which does not conflict (with the Scriptures) is concerned, we welcome that portion of Sāṅkhya and Yoga as having due scope.

स च कार्यकारणानन्यत्वाभ्युपगमात् प्रत्यासन्नो वेदान्तवादस्य

BSBh. 1.4.28

That school, because it accepts that a cause and its modification are non-different, is nearest to the Vedānta School.

ज्ञानज्ञेयज्ञातृभेदरहितं परमार्थतत्त्वमद्वयमेतन्न बुद्धेन भाषितम् ।
यद्यपि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणं ज्ञानमात्रकल्पना च
अद्वयवस्तुसामीप्यमुक्तम्

Ma.Up. 4.99 Bh.

Mention of the fact that the supreme Reality is non-dual and devoid of distinctions such as the knowledge, the known and the knower, has not been made by the Buddha, though by a denial of external objects and by imagining everything as nothing but consciousness, what he said comes almost near non-dualism.

Section 61

References:

अपि च आगमबलेन ब्रह्मवादी कारणादिस्वरूपं निरूपयतीति
नावश्यं तस्य यथादृष्टमेव सर्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यमिति नियमोऽस्ति
परस्य तु दृष्टान्तबलेन कारणादिस्वरूपं निरूपयतः
यथादृष्टमेव सर्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यमित्ययमस्त्यतिशयः

BSBh. 2.2.38

Besides, as the adherents of the doctrine of Brahman, explain the nature of the cause etc., on the authority of the Scriptures. There could be no rule, by which he

would be obliged to understand all things, only, as he perceives them. There is a special obligation on the opponent of the Vedānta (the Sāṅkhya) to understand things as he perceives them. As he explains the nature of the cause etc., on the strength of an illustration (Dṛṣṭānta) i.e. a parallel instance.

न हि दृष्टान्त-दार्ष्टान्तिकयोः क्वचित् कञ्चित् विवक्षितमंशं मुक्त्वा सर्वसारूप्यं केनचित् दर्शयितुं शक्यते । सर्वसारूप्ये हि दृष्टान्त-दार्ष्टान्तिकभावोच्छेद एव स्यात्

BSBh. 3.2.20

It is not possible for anybody to demonstrate that an illustration and an entity illustrated are completely alike, apart from their being similar to some particular small extent. Because were they to be completely alike, their relation between themselves as an illustration and an entity illustrated, would itself be destroyed.

Section 62

References:

न हि - डुण्डुभः सर्प इव - इत्येतावता सविषो भवति, सर्पो वा डुण्डुभ इव - इत्येतावता निर्विषो भवति

BSBh. 2.2.10

If it is said (by any body) that an amphisbaena (Ḍuṇḍubha, a carnivorous worm) is 'as it were' a snake, it would not, simply because it is so said, become a poisonous snake, nor would a snake become non-poisonous, simply because it is said, that, it is, 'as it were' an amphisbaena.

न चेदं स्वमनीषया जलसूर्यकादि-दृष्टान्तप्रणयनम्

शास्त्रप्रणीतस्य तु अस्य प्रयोजनमात्रमुपन्यस्यते

BSBh. 3.2.20

Besides this reference to the illustration of a reflection of the Sun in the water, is not made (by the Sūtra-kāra) out of his own imagination. But, already referred to by the Śāstra as it is, its propriety only is indicated here.

न हि अभिलषितसिद्धिनिबन्धना व्यवस्था शक्या विज्ञातुम्

BSBh. 2.3.50

It is not possible to understand any such adjustment as depending upon the attainment of the desired aim (i.e. liberation).

शृणु, अतो यद्भवति ; यथाभूता मूर्तामूर्तादिपदार्थधर्मा लोके प्रसिद्धाः ; तद्दृष्टान्तोपादानेन तदविरोध्येव वस्त्वन्तरं ज्ञापयितुं प्रवृत्तं शास्त्रं न लौकिकवस्तुविरोधज्ञापनाय लौकिकमेव दृष्टान्तमुपादत्ते ; उपादीयमानोऽपि दृष्टान्तः अनर्थकः स्यात् , दार्ष्टान्तिकासङ्गतेः ; न हि अग्निः शीतः आदित्यो न तपतीति वा दृष्टान्तशतेनापि प्रतिपादयितुं शक्यम् , प्रमाणान्तरेण अन्यथाधिगतत्वाद्वस्तुनः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Listen. Things in the world are known to possess certain fixed characteristics such as grossness or fineness. By citing them as examples the scriptures seek to tell us about some other thing which does not contradict them. They would not cite an example from life if they wanted to convey an idea of something contradictory to it. Even if they did, it would be to no purpose, for the example would be different from the thing to be explained. You cannot prove that fire is cold, or that the sun does not give heat, even by citing a hundred examples, for the facts would already be known to be otherwise through another means ot knowledge.

न; अविद्यमानार्थकल्पनायां सर्वार्थसिद्धिप्रसङ्गात् । इयानेवाविद्यमानो विरुद्धोऽविरुद्धो वा अर्थः कल्पनीयः, नातोऽधिकः - इति नियमहेत्वभावात् । कल्पनायाश्च स्वायत्तत्वात्प्रभूतत्वसम्भवाच्च -

BSBh. 2.2.17

Reply: we remark that the assumption of nonexisting things would involve the result that anything might be established; for there is no restrictive rule that only such and such nonexisting things whether contradictory to reason or not should be assumed and not any other, and assumptions depend on one's choice only and may be carried to any extent.

ततश्च यथा शुक्तिकां रजतमिति प्रत्येतीत्यत्र । शुक्ति-वचन एव शुक्तिका-शब्दः ।

रजत-शब्दस्तु रजत-प्रतीतिलक्षणार्थः । प्रत्येत्येव हि केवलं रजतमिति, न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति

BSBh. 4.1.5

Hence as in the sentence ‘He perceives the mother-of-pearl as silver’, while the word ‘mother-of-pearl’ means the mother-of-pearl, **the word ‘silver’ means only the perception of silver (in the mother-of-pearl). Man (person) merely perceives it as silver when no silver is (truly) there.**

न हि मनोविकल्पनाया रज्जुसर्पादिलक्षणाया रज्ज्वां प्रलय उत्पत्तिर्वा ; न च मनसि रज्जुसर्पस्योत्पत्तिः प्रलयो वा, न चोभयतो वा

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.32 Bh.

The imagination characterised by the appearance of the snake in the rope cannot be produced from nor dissolved in the rope (i.e., in any external object), nor is produced from the imaginary snake or dissolved in the mind, nor even in both (i.e., the rope and the mind).

Section 63

References:

वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः,
नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता।

BSBh. 1.1.2

For the knowledge of Brahman is effected by the determination (brought about) by **the consideration of the meaning of the Vedānta passages**, **and not by the other means of knowledge such as inference** etc.

तार्किको ह्यनागमज्ञः स्वबुद्धिपरिकल्पितं यत्किञ्चिदेव कल्पयति

अत एव च येयमागमप्रभूता मतिः अन्येनैव आगमाभिज्ञेनाचार्येणैव तार्किकात् , प्रोक्ता सती सुज्ञानाय भवति हे प्रेष्ठ प्रियतम

Kath.Up. 1.2.9 Bh.

for a logician who is not versed in the scriptures will speak only what is manufactured by his own intellect.

Therefore, O dearest one, this wisdom arising from the scriptures, only if taught by a person other than a logician, i.e. by a teacher who is conversant with the scriptures, constitutes the right knowledge.

Section 64

References:

यदपि शास्त्रतात्पर्यविदाम् अनुक्रमणम् – 'दृष्टो हि तस्यार्थः कर्मावबोधनम्' इत्येवमादि, तत् धर्मजिज्ञासाविषयत्वाद् विधिप्रतिषेध-शास्त्राभिप्रायं द्रष्टव्यम्।

BSBh. 1.1.4

The statement of those who know the purport of the Śāstras, viz. "We have seen that the meaning of that is the knowledge of action" etc., Being with regard to the subject relating to the desire to know 'Duty' (Dharma), should be understood as purporting to relate to the Śāstra of injunctions and prohibitions (i.e., the Karma-kāṇḍa of the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā).

न च परिनिष्ठित-वस्तुस्वरूपत्वेऽपि प्रत्यक्षादिविषयत्वं ब्रह्मणः

'तत्त्वमसि' (छ।उप् ।६।८।७) इति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्य शास्त्रम् अन्तरेणानवगम्यमानत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Nor can Brahman, though it is determined to be of the nature of an already established entity, be an object of direct perception. Because it is not possible to comprehend, except by means of the Śāstra, that the Self is Brahman, as conveyed by the Scriptural passage – "That thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7).

यत्तु हेयोपादेय-रहितत्वाद् उपदेशानर्थक्यमिति ।

नैष दोषः; हेयोपादेयशून्य-ब्रह्मात्मतावगमादेव सर्वक्लेश-प्रहाणात् पुरुषार्थसिद्धेः

BSBh. 1.1.4

As regards the objection (of the opponent) that any instruction which does not require the giving up or the accepting of anything, is purposeless

Reply: This is no fault, because the highest aim of man is accomplished by knowing that Brahman from which nothing can be discarded and to which nothing can be added, is the Self, and that it destroys all misery.

सर्वेषु हि वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि

BSBh. 1.1.4

In all the Vedānta texts the sentences construe properly by indicating that to be the meaning.

न च तेषां कर्तृदेवतादि-स्वरूपप्रतिपादनपरता अवसीयते, ‘तत्केन कं पश्येत्’ (ब्र्।उप्। २।४।१४) इत्यादिक्रियाकारकफल-निराकरणश्रुतेः

BSBh. 1.1.4

It cannot be understood that they propound the nature of the agent, because of the Scriptural statement “Then by what should one see and whom?” (Br.Up. 2.4.14) which in effect rejects all actions, agents and fruits.

देवतादिप्रतिपादनस्य तु स्ववाक्यगतोपासनार्थत्वेऽपि न कश्चिद्विरोधः

न तु तथा ब्रह्मण उपासनाविधिशेषत्वं सम्भवति । एकत्वे हेयोपादेयशून्यतया क्रियाकारकादि-द्वैतविज्ञानोपमर्दोपपत्तेः । न हि एकत्वविज्ञानेनोन्मथितस्य द्वैतविज्ञानस्य पुनः सम्भवोऽस्ति,

येनोपासनाविधिशेषत्वं ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपाद्येत

BSBh. 1.1.4

There is no contradiction even if it be understood that it has the purpose of propounding the deities etc. connected with the devout meditation referred to in its own passages (in Vedānta). Understanding it even in that manner would not render Brahman as being supplementary to an injunction for devout meditation. For it can be reasonably sustainable that when the unity of Brahman and the Self is understood, there is destruction of all notions of duality, of actions, agents etc., there

being then nothing to give up or to accept. **There is no possibility of the revival of the notion of duality which has once been uprooted by the knowledge** of absolute unity because of which we would again arrive at the conclusion about Brahman being supplementary to an injunction for devout meditation.

Section 65

References:

योऽसावुपनिषत्स्वेवाधिगतः पुरुषोऽसंसारी ब्रह्मस्वरूपः उत्पाद्यादि-चतुर्विधद्रव्यविलक्षणः स्वप्रकरणस्थोऽनन्यशेषः, नासौ नास्ति नाधिगम्यत इति वा शक्यं वदितुम् । 'स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।९।२६) इत्यात्मशब्दात् । आत्मनश्च प्रत्याख्यातुमशक्यत्वात्, य एव निराकर्ता तस्यैवात्मत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

It cannot be said about that Puruṣa which can be comprehended only from the Upaniṣads, and which is not of a transmigratory nature, and which in fact is Brahman, and is different from the fourfold materials of things which are liable to be created etc., and which is a topic in itself, and is not subsidiary to any thing else, that it is not, or that it cannot be comprehended. Because, in the following scriptural passage it is described as the Ātmā

(the Self) thus – (The Self can only be described negatively as) "Ātmā is, not that, not that" (Br.Up. 3.9.26).

And **it is not possible to deny the Self, because whosoever endeavours to deny it, is himself the Self (Ātmā).**

तस्मात् 'पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः' (कथ्।उप्। १।३।११) 'तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।९।२६) इति चौपनिषदत्वविशेषणं

पुरुषस्योपनिषत्सु प्राधान्येन प्रकाश्यमानत्वे उपपद्यते ।

अतो भूतवस्तुपरो वेदभागो नास्तीति वचनं साहसमात्रम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Therefore, the particularization of the Puruṣa as the one belonging to the Upaniṣads, in the passages "There is nothing beyond the Puruṣa, he is the final goal and the transcendental condition" (KathU.1.3.11), and "I ask you about the Puruṣa mentioned in the Upaniṣads" (Br.Up. 3.9.26) can be proper, only if the Puruṣa is principally the subject illustrated in the Upaniṣads. Therefore, it is but a bold and reckless statement that no portion of the scriptural texts treats of an existing entity.

न ह्येवंलक्षणमात्मनो याथात्म्यम् उत्पाद्यं विकार्यम् आप्यं संस्कार्यं वा कर्तृभोक्तृरूपं वा, येन कर्मशेषता स्यात् ।
सर्वासामुपनिषदामात्मयाथात्म्यनिरूपणेनैवोपक्षयात्

Isa.Up. Upod. Bh.

The Self in Its true nature as described above is not something produced or transformed, attained, or purified, nor is It a doer or an enjoyer, by which It could be a factor in karma. All the Upanishads sum up themselves only by ascertaining the true nature of the Self.

किमर्थानि तर्हि 'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । ५) इत्यादीनि विधिच्छायानि वचनानि ?
स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तिविषयविमुखीकरणार्थानीति ब्रूमः । यो हि बहिर्मुखः प्रवर्तते पुरुषः 'इष्टं मे भूयादनिष्टं मा भूत्ऽ इति, न च तत्रात्यन्तिकं पुरुषार्थं लभते, तमात्यन्तिकपुरुषार्थवाञ्छिनं स्वाभाविकात्कार्यकरणसङ्घातप्रवृत्तिगोचरादविमुखीकृत्य प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्तयन्ति 'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यःऽ इत्यादीनि ; तस्यात्मान्वेषणाय प्रवृत्तस्याहेयमनुपादेयं चात्मतत्त्वमुपदिश्यते – 'इदं सर्वं यदयमात्माऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । ६) 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत् ॥। केन कं विजानीयात्ऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) 'विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्ऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । १४) 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) इत्यादिभिः

BSBh. 1.1.4

Objection: What then is the purport (the opponent asks) of passages like “The Self (Oh Maitreyī) is to be seen, heard etc.” (Br.Up. 2.4.5) which have an appearance of an injunction?

Reply: They are for the purpose of making (a man) averse to the objects of his natural tendency. In the case of a man who is an extrovert and acts with a view to attain the objects of his desire and to avoid things distasteful to him, He, having failed to attain the highest aim of man, is yet desirous of attaining such aim,

passages like “The Self, Oh Maitreyī, should be seen” etc. help him to set his face against the aggregate of the objects of the natural tendency of his body and sense-organs, and to direct the stream of his mind towards the Universal Self. To him who has started on the quest of the Self, the scriptures propound the true nature of the Self from which nothing can be discarded and to which nothing can be added, by means of the following passages, viz. “All this is that which is the Self” (Br.Up. 2.4.6), “When the Self only is all this, how should he see another, how should he know another, how should he know the Knower?” (Br.Up. 4.5.15), “This Self is Brahman” (Br.Up. 2.5.19) etc.

द्रष्टव्यविधेर्विषयसमर्पकाण्येतानीति चेत्

न ; अर्थान्तराभावादित्युक्तोत्तरत्वात् – आत्मवस्तुस्वरूपसमर्पकैरेव वाक्यैः 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) इत्यादिभिः श्रवणकाल एव तद्दर्शनस्य कृतत्वाद्द्रष्टव्यविधेर्नानुष्ठानान्तरं कर्तव्यमित्युक्तोत्तरमेतत्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Objection: Do they not supply the object for the injunction about realising the Self?

Reply: No, for we have already answered that point by saying that there is no reference to anything else in those passages. That is to say, since sentences such as, 'Thou art That,' which only delineate the nature of the Self, immediately lead to Its realisation, there is no further action to be done with regard to the injunction about that realisation.

Section 66

References:

उपपत्तेश्च सदसदादिशब्दैः ब्रह्म नोच्यते इति । सर्वो हि शब्दः अर्थप्रकाशनाय प्रयुक्तः, श्रूयमाणश्च श्रोतृभिः, जातिक्रियागुणसम्बन्धद्वारेण सङ्केतग्रहणसव्यपेक्षः अर्थं प्रत्याययति ; न अन्यथा, अदृष्टत्वात् । तत् यथा – 'गौःऽ 'अश्वःऽ इति वा जातितः,

‘पचतिऽ ‘पठतिऽ इति वा क्रियातः, ‘शुक्लःऽ ‘कृष्णःऽ इति वा गुणतः, ‘धनीऽ ‘गोमान्ऽ इति वा सम्बन्धतः ।

न तु ब्रह्म जातिमत् , अतः न सदादिशब्दवाच्यम् । नापि गुणवत् , येन गुणशब्देन उच्येत, निर्गुणत्वात् । नापि क्रियाशब्दवाच्यं निष्क्रियत्वात् ‘निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम्ऽ (श्वे। उ। ६ । १९) इति श्रुतेः । न च सम्बन्धी, एकत्वात् । अद्वयत्वात् अविषयत्वात् आत्मत्वाच्च न केनचित् शब्देन उच्यते इति युक्तम् ; ‘यतो वाचो निवर्तन्तेऽ (तै। उ। २ । ९ । १) इत्यादिश्रुतिभिश्च

BGh. 13.12

Speaking logically too, Brahman cannot be said as sat or asat, for all expressions intended to convey a meaning when uttered by the speaker or heard by the listener, fulfil their part in association with certain genus, act, quality or relation, for this is not seen tto be possible in any other way. This is how cow and horse come under genus (mentioned above); cooking and learning under acts, white and black under quality, and rich and owning cattle under relation.

But Brahman does not belong to any genus and cannot therefore be expressed as sat or asat, nor has it any quality to be expressed by any such term as It is nirguna, nor can It be expressed in association with an actton as It ts niskriya. The sruti says: "Brahman is

devoid of parts; devoid of action and is serene" (Sveta. Upa. 6.9). It is not related to anything else; for It is one, It is without a second, It is no object (of any sense). It is the very Self. Wherefore, it is but right to say that It can be denoted by no word at all; and the passages of the sruti like the following point to the same thing: Whence (i.e., away from Brahman, unable to approach Brahman) all words return." (Tait. Up. 2.9.1.)

अध्यारोपितनामरूपकर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म निर्दिश्यते 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २८) 'विज्ञानघन एव ब्रह्मात्माऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । १२) इत्येवमादिशब्दैः

Br.Up. 2.3.6 Bh.

Brahman is described by means of name, form and action superimposed on It, in such terms as, 'Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman' (Br.Up. 3.9.28), and 'Pure Intelligence' (Br.Up. 2.4.12), 'Brahman,' and 'Atman.'

ब्रह्मशब्दस्य हि व्युत्पाद्यमानस्य नित्य-शुद्धत्वादयोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते, बृंहतेर्धातोरर्थानुगमात्

BSBh. 1.1.1

Etymologically, from the root 'Bṛha' we understand such things as eternal purity, etc.

आत्मा आप्नोतेरत्तेरततेर्वा परः सर्वज्ञः
सर्वशक्तिरशनायादिसर्वसंसारधर्मवर्जितो
नित्यत्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावोऽजोऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयोऽद्वयो वै

Ait.Up. 1.1.1 Bh.

The word atma, Self, is derived in the sense of comprehending, engulfing or pervading, and by it is signified one that is the highest, omniscient, omnipotent, and devoid of all such worldly attributes as hunger; by nature, eternal, pure, conscious, and free; birthless, undecaying, immortal, deathless, fearless, and without a second.

'यच्चाप्नोति यदादत्ते यच्चात्ति विषयानिह । यच्चास्य सन्ततो भावस्तस्मादात्मेति कीर्त्यते' ; इत्यात्मशब्दव्युत्पत्तिस्मरणात्

Kath.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

For in the Smrti the derivation of the word is given thus: 'Since It pervades, absorbs, and enjoys (all) objects in the world, and since from It the world derives its continous existence, therefore, It is called the atma.'

कथं तर्हि ‘आत्मैवाधस्तात्’ (छा। उ। ७ । २५ । २) ‘स आत्मा’ (छा। उ। ६ । १६ । १) इत्यादिशब्दाः आत्मानं प्रत्याययन्ति ? नैष दोषः । देहवति प्रत्यगात्मनि भेदविषये प्रयुज्यमानः शब्दः देहादीनामात्मत्वे प्रत्याख्यायमाने यत्परिशिष्टं सत् , अवाच्यमपि प्रत्याययति

Chand.Up. 7.1.3 Bh.

Objection: How then could the words 'The Self alone is below' (Ch.Up. 7.25.2), and 'That is the Self (Ch.Up. 6.16.3) bring about the notion of the Self?

Vedantin: There is nothing defective, for the term (Self) employed to indicate the inner self encased in a body that is susceptible to change, when the body etc. are denied of being the Self, brings about the conviction regarding Sat (Existent) that remains as the residue though it cannot be expressed by words.

Section 67

References:

लक्षणार्थप्रधानानि विशेषणानि, न विशेषणप्रधानान्येव ।

कः पुनर्लक्षणलक्ष्ययोर्विशेषणविशेष्ययोर्वा विशेषः ?

उच्यते सजातीयेभ्य एव निवर्तकानि विशेषणानि विशेष्यस्य ; लक्षणं तु सर्वत एव, यथा अवकाशप्रदात्राकाशमिति । लक्षणार्थं च वाक्यमित्यवोचाम

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

Since the adjectives (here) bear only a predominatingly defining sense and not a predominatingly qualifying sense.

Objection: What again is the difference betweeen the two relations that existing between the definition and the thing defined; and that between the quality and the thing qualified?

Reply: An adjective distinguishes a noun from things of its own class, whereas a definition marks it out from everything else, as for instance, (the definition) akasa is that which provides space. And we said that the sentence (under discussion) stands for a definition.

सत्यादिशब्दा न परस्परं सम्बध्यन्ते, परार्थत्वात् ; विशेष्यार्था हि ते

अत एव एकैको विशेषणशब्दः परस्परं निरपेक्षो ब्रह्मशब्देन सम्बध्यते सत्यं ब्रह्म ज्ञानं ब्रह्म अनन्तं ब्रह्मेति

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

The words satya etc. are unrelated among themselves, since they subserve something else; they are meant to be applied to the substantive only. Accordingly, each of the attributive words is related with the word 'Brahman', independently of the others thus: satyam brahma, jnanam brahma, anantam brahma

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म इति ब्रह्मणो लक्षणार्थं वाक्यम्

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

The sentence satyam jnanam anantam brahma Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite is meant as a definition of Brahman.

लक्षणार्थप्रधानानि विशेषणानि, न विशेषणप्रधानान्येव

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

Since the adjectives (here) bear only a predominatingly defining sense and not a predominatingly qualifying sense.

अतः ‘सत्यं ब्रह्म’ इति ब्रह्म विकारान्निवर्तयति

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

So the phrase **satyam brahma (Brahman is truth) distinguishers Brahman from mutable things.**

अतः कारणत्वं प्राप्तं ब्रह्मणः । कारणस्य च कारकत्वम् , वस्तुत्वात् मृद्वत् अचिद्रूपता च प्राप्ता ; अत इदमुच्यते ज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति । ज्ञानं ज्ञप्तिः अवबोधः

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

From this it may follow that (the unchanging) Brahman is the (material) cause (off all subsequent chages); and since a material cause is a substance; it can be an accessory as well, thereby becoming insentient like earth. Hence it is said that **Brahman is jnanam. Jnana means knowledge, consciousness.**

‘ज्ञानं ब्रह्म’ इति वचनात्प्राप्तमन्तवत्त्वम् लौकिकस्य ज्ञानस्य अन्तवत्त्वदर्शनात् । अतः तन्निवृत्त्यर्थमाह अनन्तमिति

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

From the phrase, jnanam brahma, it may follow that Brahman is limited, **for human knowledge is seen to be finite. Hence, in order to obviate this, the text says, anantam, infinite.**

विज्ञातृस्वरूपाव्यतिरेकात्करणादिनिमित्तानपेक्षत्वाच्च ब्रह्मणो ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वेऽपि नित्यत्वप्रसिद्धिः । अतो नैव धात्वर्थस्तत् , अक्रियारूपत्वात् । अत एव च न ज्ञानकर्तृ । तस्मादेव च न ज्ञानशब्दवाच्यमपि तद्ब्रह्म । तथापि तदाभासवाचकेन बुद्धिधर्मविशेषेण ज्ञानशब्देन तल्लक्ष्यते ; न तु उच्यते, शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतुजात्यादिधर्मरहितत्वात् ।

तथा सत्यशब्देनापि । सर्वविशेषप्रत्यस्तमितस्वरूपत्वाद्ब्रह्मणः बाह्यसत्तासामान्यविषयेण सत्यशब्देन लक्ष्यते 'सत्यं ब्रह्म' इति न तु सत्यशब्दवाच्यं ब्रह्म

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

Just because Brahman's nature of being the knower is inseparable and because there is no dependence on other accessories like the sense organs, Brahman, though intrinsically identical with knowledge, is well known to be eternal. Thus, since **this knowledge is not a form of action, it does not also bear the root meaning of the verb**. Hence, too, Brahman is not the agent of congnition.

And because of this, again, It cannot even be denoted by the word jnana (knowledge). Still Brahman is indicated, but not denoted, by the word knowledge which really stands for a verisimilitude of consciousness as referring to an attribute of the intellect; for Brahman is free from such things as class etc., which make the use of the word

(knowledge) possible. Similarly, Brahman is not denoted even by the word satya (truth), since Brahman is by nature devoid of all distinctions. In this way, the word satya, which means external reality in general, can indirectly refer to Brahman (in such expressions) as 'Brahman is truth', but it cannot denote It.

एवं सत्यादिशब्दा इतरेतरसंनिधानादन्योन्यनियम्यनियामकाः सन्तः सत्यादिशब्दवाच्यात् निवर्तका ब्रह्मणः, लक्षणार्थाश्च भवन्तीति । अतः सिद्धम् 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (तै। उ। २ । ४ । १) 'अनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने' (तै। उ। २ । ७ । १) इति च अवाच्यत्वम् , नीलोत्पलवदवाक्यार्थत्वं च ब्रह्मणः

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

Thus the words truth etc., occurring in mutual proximity, and restricting and being restricted in turns by each other, distinguish Brahman from other objects denoted by the words, truth etc., and thus become fit for defining It as well. So, in accordance wiht the Vedic texts, 'Failing to reach which (Brahman), words, along with the mind turn back' (Tai.Up. 2.4.1), and '(Whenever an aspirant gets fearlessly established in this changeless, bodiless) inexpressible, and unsupporting Brahman' (Tai.Up. 2.7.1), it is proved that Brahman is indescribable, and that unlike

the construction of the expression, 'a blue lotus', Brahman is not to be construed as the import of any sentence.

तत्र अजादिशब्दैर्जन्मादयो भावविकारा निवर्तिताः । अस्थूलादिशब्दैश्च स्थौल्यादयो द्रव्यधर्माः । विज्ञानादिशब्दैश्च चैतन्य-प्रकाशात्मकत्वमुक्तम् । एष व्यावृत्त-सर्वसंसार-धर्मकोऽनुभवात्मको ब्रह्मसंज्ञकस्तत्पदार्थो वेदान्ताभियुक्तानां प्रसिद्धः । तथा त्वंपदार्थोऽपि प्रत्यगात्मा श्रोता देहादारभ्य प्रत्यगात्मतया सम्भाव्यमानः चैतन्यपर्यन्तत्वेनावधारितः

BSBh. 4.1.2

There, by the words ‘not subject to birth etc.’, birth and such other phases of existence are denied, by the words ‘neither gross etc.’, such properties of matter as grossness etc. are denied, and by the words ‘knowledge etc.’ Brahman’s being the light of sentiency is spoken of.

The entity ‘That’ (Tat) called Brahman, which is devoid of all the attributes of a transitory mundane existence, and which is capable of being realized, is well-known to those who are well-versed in Vedānta. Similarly, they also know that the entity indicated by the word ‘Thou’ (Tvam) is the Universal Highest Self (Pratyag-ātmā), the hearer, and the one which beginning with the body is understood to be the innermost Self of all and is ultimately determined to be of the nature of sentiency (Caitanya-Sva-rūpa).

त्वंसतोर्तुल्यनीडतआन् नीलाश्ववदिदं भवेत् ।

निर्दुःखवाचिना योगात् त्वंशब्दस्य तदर्थता

प्रत्यगात्माभिहानेन तच्छब्दस्य युतेस्तथा ।

दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं वाक्यं स्यात् प्रत्यगात्मनि

UPS, Metrical 18.169-170

Since [in the sentence “Thou art That” the words] “Thou” and “The Existent” (= That) have the same referent, this [sentence] is comparable to [the sentence] “The horse is black.” Since the word “Thou” is [used] in apposition to [a word – “Existent”– which] refers to the Painless One (= Brahman), it [too] refers to that [Painless One]. Likewise, since the word “That” is [used] in connection with [the word which] denotes the inner Atman, [it refers to the inner Atman]. [Just like the sentence] “You are the tenth,” the sentence [“Thou art That”] means the inner Atman.

Section 68

References:

प्रत्यगात्माभिहानेन तच्छब्दस्य युतेस्तथा ।

दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं वाक्यं स्यात् प्रत्यगात्मनि

स्वार्थस्य हृयप्रहाणेन विशिष्टार्थसमर्पकौ ।

प्रत्यगात्मावगत्यन्तौ नान्योऽर्थोऽर्थाद् विरोध्यतः

नवबुद्ध्यपहाराद् धि स्वात्मानं दशपूरणम् ।

असश्यञ् ज्ञातुमेवेच्छेत् स्वमात्मानं जनस्तथा

UPS, Metrical 18.170-172

Likewise, since the word “That” is [used] in connection with [the word which] denotes the inner Atman, [it refers to the inner Atman]. [Just like the sentence] “You are the tenth,” the sentence [“Thou art That”] means the inner Atman. Without abandoning their own meanings [the words “Thou” and “That”] convey a special meaning and result in the realization of the inner Atman. Therefore, there is no other meaning contradictory to this meaning. Since [the tenth boy] is included in the notion [“he must be among] the nine [others],” [he] tries to know [which is the tenth boy], not counting himself as making up the ten. Similarly, people [try to know] their own Atman.

मन इति प्रत्ययो विज्ञानम् । तच्च, यत्राभिधानं प्रवृत्तमतीन्द्रियेऽप्यर्थे, तदर्थे च प्रवर्तते प्रकाशनाय । यत्र च विज्ञानम् , तत्र वाचः प्रवृत्तिः । तस्मात् सहैव वाङ्मनसयोः अभिधानप्रत्ययोः प्रवृत्तिः सर्वत्र । तस्मात् ब्रह्मप्रकाशनाय सर्वथा प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रयुज्यमाना अपि वाचः यस्मादप्रत्ययविषयादनभिधेयाददृश्यादिविशेषणात् सहैव मनसा विज्ञानेन सर्वप्रकाशनसमर्थेन निवर्तन्ते ।

Tai.Up. 2.9.1 Bh.

The word manah stands for a notion, a cognition. And as a word proceeds to anything, supersensuous though it be, conceptual knowledge also strives to encompass that thing for expressing it as well; and words, too, become active where there is knowledge. Hence words and ideas, speech and mind, move together everywhere. Therefore, that Brahman which is beyond all concepts and all words, and which has such attributes as invisibility, from which words, though used by their utterers in all possible ways for expressing Brahman, return, together with the mind with conceptual knowledge that is able to express everything (else);

न च सम्बन्धी, एकत्वात्। अद्वयत्वात् अविषयत्वात् आत्मत्वाच्च न केनचित् शब्देन उच्यते इति

BGh. 13.12

Nor has It (i.e. Brahman) any relation, since It is one, non-dual, not an object of the senses, and It is the Self. Therefore, it is logical that It cannot be expressed by any word. And this follows from such Upaniṣad texts as, 'From which, words turn back' (Tai.Up. 2.4.1, Tai.Up. .9.1), etc.

Section 69

References:

तद्ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारणं वेदान्तशास्त्रादेवावगम्यते । कथम् ? समन्वयात् । सर्वेषु हि वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि । 'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् एकमेवाद्वितीयम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्ऽ (ऐ। उ। १ । १ । १) 'तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरमबाह्यम्ऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) 'ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्तात्ऽ (मु। उ। २ । २ । ११) इत्यादीनि । न च तद्गतानां पदानां ब्रह्मस्वरूपविषये निश्चिते समन्वयेऽवगम्यमाने अर्थान्तरकल्पना युक्ता, श्रुतहान्यश्रुतकल्पनाप्रसङ्गात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

That the all-powerful cause of the origin, preservation and dissolution of the transient world is the omniscient Brahman, is understood from the Vedānta Śāstra itself. How so? Because that is the connected sequence (Samanvaya). In all the Vedānta texts the sentences construe properly by intimating that to be the meaning.

For instance (the following texts) – "In the beginning, Oh Saumya, this world was just Being (Sat), the one only without a second" (Chan.Up. 6.2.1), and "This Self alone

was in existence in the beginning" (Ait.Up. 1.1.1), and "That precisely is this Brahman, without itself being the cause, without itself being an effect, having nothing inside or outside of it. This is the Self, the Brahman which perceives everything" (Br.Up. 2.5.19), and "It is that immortal Brahman right in front" (Mu.Up. 2.2.11) etc. It is not proper to attribute any other meaning to these passages when their connected sequence is determined to be with regard to the nature of Brahman, because otherwise there would be the predicament of the abandonment of what is stated in the scriptures and the acceptance of something which is not so stated.

अननुष्ठेयत्वे वाक्यप्रमाणत्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् ,

न ह्यनुष्ठेयेऽसति पदानां संहतिरुपपद्यते ; अनुष्ठेयत्वे तु सति तादर्थ्येन पदानि संहन्यन्ते ; तत्रानुष्ठेयनिष्ठं वाक्यं प्रमाणं भवति – इदमनेनैवं कर्तव्यमिति ; न त्विदमनेनैवमित्येवंप्रकाराणां पदशतानामपि वाक्यत्वमस्ति, – 'कुर्यात्क्रियेत कर्तव्यं भवेत्स्यादिति पञ्चमम्ऽ इत्येवमादीनामन्यतमेऽसति ; अतः परमात्मेश्वरादीनामवाक्यप्रमाणत्वम् ; पदार्थत्वे च प्रमाणान्तरविषयत्वम् ; अतोऽसदेतदिति चेत्

न ; 'अस्ति मेरुर्वर्णचतुष्टयोपेतःऽ इति एवमाद्यननुष्ठेयेऽपि वाक्यदर्शनात् । न च, 'मेरुर्वर्णचतुष्टयोपेतःऽ इत्येवमादिवाक्यश्रवणे मेर्वादावनुष्ठेयत्वबुद्धिरुत्पद्यते । तथा अस्तिपदसहितानां

परमात्मेश्वरादिप्रतिपादकवाक्यपदानां विशेषणविशेष्यभावेन संहतिः केन वार्यते

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

Objection: If it is not something to be done, then it will cease to have the support of Vedic testimony in the form of sentences. We do not understand how words in a sentence can be construed unless there is something to be done. But if there is something to be done, they are construed as bringing out that idea. A sentence is authoritative when it is devoted to an action–when it says that a certain thing is to be done through such and such means in a particular way. But hundreds of such words denoting the object, means and method would not make a sentence unless there is one or other of such terms as the following, 'Should do, should be done, is to be done, should become and should be.' Hence such entities as the Supreme Self and God have not the support of Vedic testimony in the form of sentences. And if they are denoted by Vedic words (instead of sentences), they become the objects of other means of knowledge. Therefore this (the fact of Brahman being the import of the Vedas) is wrong.

Reply: Not so, for we find sentences like, 'There is Mt. Meru, which is of four colours,' which relate to things

other than an action. Nor has anyone, on hearing such sentences, the idea that Meru and the rest are something to be done. Similarly, in a sentence containing the verb 'to be,' what is there to prevent the construing of its words denoting the Supreme Self, the Lord, etc., as substantives and their qualifying words?

अपि च 'ब्राह्मणो न हन्तव्यः' इति चैवमाद्या निवृत्तिरुपदिश्यते।

न च सा क्रिया। नापि क्रियासाधनम् । अक्रियार्थानाम् उपदेशोऽनर्थकश्चेत्,

'ब्राह्मणो न हन्तव्यः' इत्यादिनिवृत्त्युपदेशानाम् आनर्थक्यं प्राप्तम्। तच्चानिष्टम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Moreover the Śāstra is seen to teach 'abstinence' such as – "A Brāhmaṇa should not be killed", which is neither 'action' nor a means for 'action'. Now if instruction about entities not meant for the purpose of 'action' were to be purposeless. Then the inevitable conclusion is, that instruction about such 'abstinence' as that 'a Brāhmaṇa should not be killed' would be without a purpose, which would not be desirable.

तस्मात्प्रतिषेधविधीनां वस्तुयाथात्म्यज्ञाननिष्ठतैव, न पुरुषव्यापारनिष्ठतागन्धोऽप्यस्ति । तथेहापि परमात्मादियाथात्म्यज्ञानविधीनां तावन्मात्रपर्यवसानतैव स्यात्

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

Therefore, prohibitions have just the aim of communicating the real nature of a thing; there is not the least connection of human activity with them. Similarly here also, the injunction on the true nature of the Supreme Self etc. cannot but have that one aim.

Section 70

References:

अभ्युदयफलं धर्मज्ञानम्, तच्चानुष्ठानापेक्षम्;

निःश्रेयसफलं तु ब्रह्मज्ञानम्, न चानुष्ठानान्तरापेक्षम्

भव्यश्च धर्मो जिज्ञास्यो न ज्ञानकालेऽस्ति, पुरुषव्यापारतन्त्रत्वात्

इह तु भूतं ब्रह्म जिज्ञास्यं नित्यत्वान्न पुरुषव्यापारतन्त्रम्

BSBh. 1.1.1

Knowledge of duty has for its result secular prosperity (abhyudaya) and it expects the performance of certain actions (such as sacrifices etc.). The knowledge of Brahman, on the other hand, has for its result eternal

bliss (niḥśreyasa) and it does not expect the performance of any act. Religious duty is something which is to be done at some future time and it does not exist at the time of the acquirement of its knowledge and it depends upon the activity of a man. **Here on the other hand it is Brahman which is actually eternally in existence, that is desired to be known, and being thus eternal does not depend upon any action on the part of a man.**

एवं भूतवस्तुविषयाणां प्रामाण्यं वस्तुतन्त्रम् । तत्रैवं सति ब्रह्मज्ञानमपि वस्तुतन्त्रमेव, भूतवस्तुविषयत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.2

In this manner, the authoritativeness or validity of the knowledge of an entity actually in existence depends upon the entity itself. That being so, the knowledge of Brahman also, is knowledge depending upon the entity itself, in as much as it concerns the actually existing entity itself.

यथा विधिविषये कर्त्राद्यनेककारकोपसंहारद्वारेण वाक्यार्थज्ञानकालादन्यत्रानुष्ठेयोऽर्थोऽस्त्यग्निहोत्रादिलक्षणः ।

न तथेह परविद्याविषये वाक्यार्थज्ञानसमकाल एव तु पर्यवसितो भवति, केवलशब्दप्रकाशितार्थज्ञानमात्रनिष्ठाव्यतिरिक्ताभावात्

Mund.Up. 1.1.6 Bh.

In connection with the subject matter of injunctions are to be found certain acts which are like the Agnihotra (sacrifice), to be performed subsquent to the understanding of the meaning of the text, through a combination of numerous accessories, to wit, the agent etc. Unlike this, nothing remains to be performed here within the domain of the higher knowledge; but all actions cease simultaneously with the comprehension of the meaning of the sentences, inasmuch as nothing remains to be done apart from steadfastness only in the knowledge revealed by the words.

न ; अनुष्ठेयस्य भावाभावविशेषोपपत्तेः ।
अग्निहोत्रादिविध्यर्थज्ञानोत्तरकालम् अग्निहोत्रादिकर्म अनेकसाधनोपसंहारपूर्वकमनुष्ठेयम् 'कर्ता अहम् , मम कर्तव्यम्' इत्येवंप्रकारविज्ञानवतः अविदुषः यथा अनुष्ठेयं भवति, न तु तथा 'न जायते' इत्याद्यात्मस्वरूपविध्यर्थज्ञानोत्तरकालभावि किञ्चिदनुष्ठेयं भवति ; किं तु 'नाहं कर्ता, नाहं भोक्ता' इत्याद्यात्मैकत्वाकर्तृत्वादिविषयज्ञानात् नान्यदुत्पद्यते इति एष विशेष उपपद्यते

BGh. 2.21

Vedāntin: No. There can reasonable be a distinction between the existence or nonexistence of a thing to be performed. As after the knowledge of the meaning of the

injunction for rites like Agnihotra etc. their performance becomes obligatory on the unenlightened one who thinks, 'Agnihotra etc. has to be performed by collecting various accessories; I am the agent, and this is my duty', - unlike this, nothing remains later on to be performed as a duty after knowing the meaning of the injunction about the nature of the Self from such texts as, 'Never is this One born,' etc. But apart from the rise of knowledge regarding the unity of the Self, his non-agency, etc., in the form, 'I am not the agent, I am not the enjoyer', etc., no other idea arises. Thus, this distinction can be maintained.

इति गुह्यतमं शास्त्रमिदमुक्तं मयानघ ।

एतद्बुद्ध्वा बुद्धिमान्स्यात्कृतकृत्यश्च भारत

BG. 15.20 (smriti)

Thus, this most Secret Science has been taught by Me, O sinless one; on knowing this, (a man) becomes wise, O Bharata and all his duties are accomplished.

Section 71

References:

'अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घम्ऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ८)

'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययम्ऽ (क। उ। १ । ३ । १५), (मुक्ति। उ। २ ।

७२), 'आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्मऽ (छा। उ। ८ । १४ । १) 'दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजःऽ (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) 'तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरमबाह्यमयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) इत्येवमादीनि वाक्यानि निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वप्रधानानि, न अर्थान्तरप्रधानानि – इत्येतत्प्रतिष्ठापितम् 'तत्तु समन्वयात्ऽ (ब्र। सू। १ । १ । ४) इत्यत्र ; तस्मादेवंजातीयकेषु वाक्येषु यथाश्रुतं निराकारमेव ब्रह्म अवधारयितव्यम् । इतराणि तु आकारवद्ब्रह्मविषयाणि वाक्यानि न तत्प्रधानानि ; उपासनाविधिप्रधानानि हि तानि ; तेष्वसति विरोधे यथाश्रुतमाश्रयितव्यम् ; सति तु विरोधे तत्प्रधानानि अतत्प्रधानेभ्यो बलीयांसि भवन्ति – इत्येष विनिगमनायां हेतुः, येन उभयीष्वपि श्रुतिषु सतीषु अनाकारमेव ब्रह्म अवधार्यते

BSBh. 3.2.14

It is neither coarse nor fine, neither short nor long' (Bṛ. Up. 3.8.8); 'That which is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay' (Ka.Up. 1.3.15); 'He who is called ether is the revealer of all forms and names. That within which forms and names are, that is Brahman' (Ch. Up. 8.14.1); 'That heavenly person is without body, he is both without and within, not produced' (Mu.Up. 2.1.2); 'That Brahman is without cause and without effect, without anything inside or outside, this Self is Brahman, omnipresent and omniscient' (Bṛ.Up. 2.5.19). These and similar passages have for their purport the true nature of

Brahman as nonconnected with any world, and have not any other purport, as we have proved under BSBh. 1.1.4. On the ground of such passages we therefore must definitively conclude that Brahman is devoid of form. Those other passages, on the other hand, which refer to a Brahman qualified by form do not aim at setting forth the nature of Brahman, but rather at enjoining the worship of Brahman. As long as those latter texts do not contradict those of the former class, they are to be accepted as they stand; where, however, contradictions occur, the passages whose main subject is Brahman must be viewed as having greater force than those of the other kind. This is the reason for our deciding that although there are two different classes of scriptural texts, Brahman must be held to be altogether without form.

अतस्तद्ब्रह्म, यस्येयं जिज्ञासा प्रस्तुता। तद्यदि कर्तव्यशेषत्वेनोपदिश्येत ।

तेन च कर्तव्येन साध्यश्चेन्मोक्षोऽभ्युपगम्येत, अनित्य एव स्यात् ।

तत्रैवं सति यथोक्तकर्मफलेष्वेव तारतम्यावस्थितेष्वनित्येषु कश्चिदतिशयो मोक्ष इति प्रसज्येत । नित्यश्च मोक्षः सर्वैर्मोक्षवादिभिरभ्युपगम्यते ।अतो न कर्तव्यशेषत्वेन ब्रह्मोपदेशो युक्तः

BSBh. 1.1.4

Hence if this Brahman, an inquiry about which is proposed here, were to be propounded (by the Scriptures) as being supplementary to action (Karma), and were liberation (Mokṣa) to be understood as obtainable through action, it would necessarily be of a transitory nature, and it would then come to this, that liberation is but only a superior type of a transitory fruit of actions as amongst those described above, and which stand to each other in the comparative degrees (of greatness or smallness). All those who regard liberation as a creed, understand it as being eternal, and therefore it would not be proper to propound Brahman as being supplementary to action.

आत्मस्वरूपान्वाख्यानमात्रेणात्मविज्ञाने विधिमन्तरेण न प्रवर्तत इति चेत् । न ; आत्मवादिवाक्यश्रवणेनात्मविज्ञानस्य जनितत्वात् – किं भोः कृतस्य करणम् ।

तच्छ्रवणेऽपि न प्रवर्तत इति चेत् । न ; अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् – यथात्मवादिवाक्यार्थश्रवणे विधिमन्तरेण न प्रवर्तते, तथा विधिवाक्यार्थश्रवणेऽपि विधिमन्तरेण न प्रवर्तिष्यत इति विध्यन्तरापेक्षा ; तथा तदर्थश्रवणेऽपीत्यनवस्था प्रसज्येत

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Objection: A man does not proceed to know the Self immediately on hearing a statement of the nature of the Self, unless there is an injunction to that effect.

Reply: Not so, **for the knowledge of the Self is already attained by hearing the dictum about It. So what is the good of doing It over again?**

Objection: He may not even proceed to hear about the Self. (So an injunction is necessary.)

Reply: Not so, for it would lead to a regressus in infinitum. In other words, just as without an injunction he does not proceed to hear the meaning of a passage about the Self, similarly he would not, in the absence of another injunction, proceed to hear the meaning of a passage enjoining this; so another injunction is necessary. Similarly with that injunction too. Hence there would be a regressus in infinitum.

Section 72

References:

तत्रापि प्रवर्तकप्रमाणाभावे प्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तिः इति चेत् ।

न स्वात्मविषयत्वादात्मविज्ञानस्य

BGh. 2.69

Objection: In the absence of an injunction (pravartaka pramana = vidhi) one cannot have recourse to that course either.

Reply: No, for the knowledge of Atman means the knowledge of one's own Self.

यदि ह्यवगतं ब्रह्मान्यत्र विनियुज्येत, भवेत्तदा विधिशेषत्वम् ; न तु तदस्ति, मननिदिध्यासनयोरपि श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

If Brahman, after having been comprehended, stood in a subordinate relation to some injunctions, it might be said to be merely supplementary. But this is not the case, since contemplation and reflection no less than hearing are subservient to comprehension.

द्रष्टव्यादि-शब्दा अपि परविद्याधिकारपठिताः । तत्त्वाभिमुखीकरण-प्रधानाः न तत्त्वावबोधविधि-प्रधाना भवन्ति । लोकेऽपि - इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णयेति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु । प्रणिधानमात्रं कुर्वित्युच्यते । न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुर्विति

BSBh. 3.2.21

So, words such as "Ātmā should be seen etc." used in the chapter dealing with Brahma-Vidyā, also would not have the purport of an injunction to realize the truth. But would be for the purpose of bringing a person face to face with the Truth (Tattva) i.e. Brahman. **Even in the ordinary world, directions such as 'see this', 'listen to**

this' are only meant to imply, that one should give one's attention (to what is being said), and there is no direct injunction that one should actually attain any knowledge.

यथा च, दर्शपूर्णमासादिक्रिया इदम्फला विशिष्टेतिकर्तव्यताका एवंक्रमप्रयुक्ताङ्गा च – इत्येतदलौकिकं वस्तु प्रत्यक्षाद्यविषयं तथाभूतं च वेदवाक्यैरेव ज्ञाप्यते ; तथा, परमात्मेश्वरदेवतादिवस्तु अस्थूलादिधर्मकमशनायाद्यतीतं चेत्येवमादिविशिष्टमिति वेदवाक्यैरेव ज्ञाप्यते – इति अलौकिकत्वात्तथाभूतमेव भवितुमर्हतीति

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

That rites like the new and full moon sacrifices produce such and such results and have to be performed in a certain definite way, with their parts following each other in a particular order, is a supersensuous matter beyond the range of our perception and inference, which we nevertheless understand as true solely from the words of the Vedas. Similarly it stands to reason that entities like the Supreme Self, the Lord, the deities, etc., of which we learn, also from the words of the Vedas, as being characterised by the absence of grossness etc., being beyond hunger and the like, and so on, must be true, for they are equally supersensuous matters.

Section 73

References:

यदि संसार्येव आत्मा शारीरः कर्ता भोक्ता च शरीरमात्र-व्यतिरेकेण वेदान्तेषु उपदिष्टः स्यात् । ततो वर्णितेन प्रकारेण फलश्रुतेः अर्थवादत्वं स्यात् ।

अधिकस्तावत् शारीरादात्मनः असंसारी ईश्वरः कर्तृत्वादिसंसारिधर्म-रहितोऽपहतपाप्मत्वादि-विशेषणः परमात्मा वेद्यत्वेन

उपदिश्यते वेदान्तेषु । न च तद्विज्ञानं कर्मणां प्रवर्तकं भवति, प्रत्युत कर्माण्युच्छिनत्ति - इति वक्ष्यति 'उपमर्दं च' (ब्स्भ्। ३।४।१६) इत्यत्र

BSBh. 3.4.8

If the Vedānta texts were to give instruction, only about the transmigratory Jīva-Self as being embodied and as one that is an agent and an experiencer, also as being different from the body,

Then, in the manner described, the scriptural statements about the fruit (i.e. the chief aim of man viz. liberation) would be of the nature of an Artha-vāda. The Vedānta texts however teach about one who is even greater than the Jīva-Self, viz., the non-transmigratory Highest Lord, (who is) free from the nature of being either an agent or a transmigratory being and is characterized by the nature of being free from all sin, as an entity fit to be known. The Sūtra-kāra will hereafter (in BSBh. 3.4.16) say that

the knowledge of that (Brahman) not only does not stimulate any action, but on the contrary, uproots all actions as such.

अनन्यशेषत्वाच्च तज्ज्ञानस्य, जुह्वामिव, फलश्रुतेरर्थवादत्वानुपपत्तिः
Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.
Besides, since the knowledge of Brahman does not form part of anything else (e.g., an action), the results practiced about it cannot be a mere eulogy as in the case of the sacrificial ladle.

तद्यत्र सोऽवान्तरवाक्यार्थः प्रमाणान्तरगोचरो भवति । तत्र तदनुवादेनार्थवादः प्रवर्तते । यत्र प्रमाणान्तरविरुद्धः, तत्र गुणवादेन । यत्र तु तदुभयं नास्ति । तत्र किं प्रमाणान्तराभावाद्गुणवादः स्यात् । आहोस्त्वित्प्रमाणान्तराविरोधाद्विद्यमानार्थवाद इति - प्रतीतिशरणैर्विद्यमानार्थवाद आश्रयणीयः, न गुणवादः
BSBh. 1.3.33
Now, where the meaning of the subsidiary (i.e. Artha-vāda) sentence, is perceivable by another means-of-proof, there the Artha-vāda acts as an Anuvāda (i.e. it only recalls a fact). And where it is not so perceivable by another means-of-proof, it acts as a Guṇa-vāda (i.e. it refers only to a quality suggested by the Artha-vāda sentence). When neither of these alternatives is available and when there is a doubt as to whether, in the absence of any other means-of-proof, a Guṇa-vāda should be understood to be present, or, whether in the absence of

any conflict with any other means-of-proof, an Anuvāda should be understood to be present, – Then, in such a predicament, those who wholly depend upon actual perception or apprehension and consider it to be the Vartamāna vāda i.e. Anuvāda, should construe it to be a Vartamāna vāda and not a Guṇa-vāda.

'पारिप्लवमाचक्षीतऽ इति हि प्रकृत्य, 'मनुर्वैवस्वतो राजाऽ इत्येवमादीनि कानिचिदेव आख्यानानि तत्र विशेष्यन्ते । आख्यानसामान्याच्चेत् सर्वगृहीतिः स्यात् , अनर्थकमेवेदं विशेषणं भवेत् । तस्मात् न पारिप्लवार्था एता आख्यानश्रुतयः

BSBh. 3.4.23

It is in connection with the passage – "Pāri-plava should be recited", that, only certain specific legends such as "The king Manu, the son of Vivasvat" etc. are mentioned there. If by the scriptural statement all legends (in the Upaniṣads) in general were to be understood (as meant for Pāri-plava) because of these particular legends being similar to legends generally, their special specification by the scriptures would be meaningless. Hence these scriptural legends are not for the purpose of Pāri-plava.

असति च पारिप्लवार्थत्वे आख्यानानां सन्निहितविद्याप्रतिपादनोपयोगितैव न्याय्या, एकवाक्यतोपबन्धात् ; तथा हि तत्र तत्र सन्निहिताभिर्विद्याभिरेकवाक्यता दृश्यते प्ररोचनोपयोगात् प्रतिपत्तिसौकर्योपयोगाच्च

BSBh. 3.4.24

It is logical, that inasmuch as these legends are not meant for the purpose of Pāri-plava, they should be understood as being useful for the propounding of the Vidyās proximate to them, because there is a connection of syntactical unity (between them and the Vidyās). For it is seen that there is such unity with the proximate Vidyās, in that they are useful for creating a taste (for the Vidyās), and for their easy comprehension.

Section 74

References:

नवबुद्ध्यपहाराद् धि स्वात्मानं दशपूरणम् ।

असश्यञ् ज्ञातुमेवेच्छेत् स्वमात्मानं जनस्तथा

अविद्याबद्धचक्षुष्ट्वात् कामापहृतधीः सदा ।

विविक्तं दृशिमात्मानं नेक्षते दशमं यथा

दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यतः ।

स्वमात्मानं विजानाति कृत्स्नान्तःकरणेक्षणम्

UPS Metrical, 18.172-174

Since [the tenth boy] is included in the notion [“he must be among] the nine [others],”[he] tries to know [which is the

tenth boy], not counting himself as making up the ten. Similarly people [try to know] their own Atman.
Because their eyes are bound by nescience those people whose intellect is seized by desire do not clearly realize themselves to be the Seeing, just as [the tenth boy] does not realize himself to be the tenth. [Just as the boy knew himself to be the tenth through the sentence] “You are the tenth,” so through such sentences as “Thou art That” one knows one’s own Atman; the Witness of all the internal organs.

वाक्यजनितविज्ञानमात्रान्नाब्रह्मानात्मविज्ञाननिवृत्तिरिति चेत् ।
न ; ‘तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) ‘नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) ‘आत्मैवेदम्ऽ (छा। उ। ७ । २५ । २) ‘एकमेवाद्वितीयम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) ‘ब्रह्मैवेदममृतम्ऽ (मु। उ। २ । २ । ११) ‘नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ११) ‘तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धिऽ (के। उ। १ । ५) इत्यादिवाक्यानां तद्वादित्वात्
Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.
Objection: The mere knowledge arising from those passages does not suffice to remove the consciousness of entities other than the Self or Brahman.
Reply: Not so, for such passages as, ‘Thou art That,’ ‘Not this, not this,’ ‘All this is but the Self’ (Ch.Up. 7.25.2), ‘One only without a second,’ ‘This universe is but Brahman and immortal' (Mu. Up. 2.2.11), ‘There is no other witness but This’ (Br.Up. 3.8.11), and ‘Know that

alone to be Brahman' (Ke.Up. 1.5), describe the Reality alone.

प्रत्यक्षादीनि बाधेरन् कृष्णलादिषु पाकवत् ।
अक्षजादिनिभैरेतैः कथं स्याद् वाक्यबाधनम्
UPS, Metrical 18.183
[Objection:] “Sense-perception and other [means of knowledge] do sublate [knowledge arising from sentences], as [they do in the case of the sentence describing] cooking as applied to grains of gold and so on.”
[Reply:] How can [knowledge arising from] sentences be sublated by that erroneous [knowledge] which arises from sense-perception and other [means of knowledge]?

प्रत्यगात्मन आत्मत्वं दुःख्यस्मीत्यस्य बाधया ।
दशमं नवमस्येव वेद चेदविरुद्धता
UPS, Metrical 18.187
If one knows that the inner Atman is the [highest] Atman by sublating the [knowledge] that I suffer pain, just as [the boy knew he was] the tenth by sublating the knowledge that he was among the nine [others], there is no contradiction.

‘तद्धास्य विजज्ञौ’ (छ।उप्। ६।१६।३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ।
अवगतिसाधनानां च श्रवणादीनां वेदानुवचनादीनां च विधीयमानत्वात् ।

न चेयमवगतिरनर्थिका भ्रान्तिर्वेति शक्यं वक्तुम् ।
अविद्यानिवृत्तिफलदर्शनात्, बाधकज्ञानान्तराभावाच्च
BSBh. 2.1.14

For a Scriptural passage says – "He (i.e. Śvetaketu) understood that (viz. the oneness of Self) from him (i.e. his father)" (ChanU.6.16.3), and there is besides instruction (in scriptures) about listening to the scriptures and reciting them, as the means of such realization. Nor is it possible to say that such realization is meaningless or is a delusion, because it is seen, that it has the result of removing ignorance, and there is absence of any other knowledge, which would invalidate it.

तत्र येषाम् एतौ पदार्थौ अज्ञानसंशयविपर्यय-प्रतिबद्धौ, तेषां ।
'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येतद्वाक्यं स्वार्थे प्रमां नोत्पादयितुं शक्नोति, पदार्थज्ञान-पूर्वकत्वाद् वाक्यार्थज्ञानस्य - इत्यतः, तान्प्रति एष्टव्यः पदार्थविवेक-प्रयोजनः शास्त्रयुक्त्यभ्यासः
BSBh 4.1.2

Now, in the case of those whose comprehension of the meaning of these two terms is obstructed, i.e. coloured by ignorance, doubt, and confusion. The sentence "That thou art" is unable to generate appropriate knowledge of what these words mean, because, the **knowledge of the meaning of all the words (of a sentence), is a pre-requisite for the knowledge of the meaning of such a sentence**. And hence in their case, the repetition of the

study of scriptural passages and reasoning, which results in the proper discrimination of the words, is necessary.

शरीरारम्भकस्य कर्मणो नियतफलत्वात् , सम्यग्ज्ञानप्राप्तावपि अवश्यंभाविनी प्रवृत्तिर्वाङ्मनःकायानाम् , लब्धवृत्तेः कर्मणो बलीयस्त्वात् – मुक्तेष्वादिप्रवृत्तिवत् ; तेन पक्षे प्राप्तं ज्ञानप्रवृत्तिदौर्बल्यम् । तस्मात् त्यागवैराग्यादिसाधनबलावलम्बेन आत्मविज्ञानस्मृतिसन्ततिर्नियन्तव्या भवति ; न त्वपूर्वा कर्तव्या ; प्राप्तत्वात् – इत्यवोचाम । तस्मात्प्राप्तविज्ञानस्मृतिसन्ताननियमविध्यर्थानि 'विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वीतऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २१) इत्यादिवाक्यानि, अन्यार्थासम्भवात्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

since the resultant of past actions that led to the formation of the present body must produce definite results, speech, mind and the body are bound to work even after the highest realisation, for actions that have begun to bear fruit are stronger than knowledge; as for instance an arrow that has been let fly continues its course for some time. Hence the operation of knowledge, being weaker than they, (is liable to be interrupted by them and) becomes only a possible alternative. Therefore, there is need to regulate the train of remembrance of the knowledge of the Self by having recourse to means such as renunciation and dispassion; but it is not something that is to be originally enjoined, being, as we said, already known as a possible alternative. Hence, we

conclude that passages such as, '(The aspirant after Brahman) knowing about this alone, should attain intuitive knowledge,' are only meant to lay down the rule that the train of remembrance– already known (as a possible alternative)–of the knowledge of the Self must be kept up, for they can have no other import.

अनर्थत्वावगतेश्च आत्मावगतौ हि सत्याम् अन्यद्वस्तु अनर्थत्वेनावगम्यते, अनित्यदुःखाशुद्ध्यादिबहुदोषवत्त्वात् आत्मवस्तुनश्च तद्विलक्षणत्वात् ।
तस्मादनात्मविज्ञानस्मृतीनामात्मावगतेरभावप्राप्तिः
Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.
Moreover, everything else is then known to be an evil. In other words, when the Self is known, things other than It are realised as evils, being full of defects such as transitoriness, painfulness and impurity, while the Self is contrary to them. **Therefore, the memories of notions about the non-Self die out when the Self is known.**

तम् ईदृशमात्मानमेव, धीरः धीमान् विज्ञाय उपदेशतः शास्त्रतश्च, प्रज्ञां शास्त्राचर्योपदिष्टविषयां जिज्ञासापरिसमाप्तिकरीम् , कुर्वीत ब्राह्मणः – एवं प्रज्ञाकरणसाधनानि सन्न्यासशमदमोपरमतितिक्षासमाधानानि कुर्यादित्यर्थः
Br.Up. 4.4.21 Bh.

The intelligent aspirant after Brahman, knowing about this kind of Self alone, from the instructions of a teacher and from the scriptures, should attain intuitive knowledge of what has been taught by the teacher and the scriptures, so as to put an end to all questioning–i.e., practise the means of this knowledge, viz. renunciation, calmness, selfcontrol, withdrawal of the senses, fortitude and concentration.

रज्जुरिव सर्पादिभिर्विकल्प्यमाना स्थानत्रयेऽप्यात्मैक एव
अन्तःप्रज्ञादित्वेन विकल्प्यते यदा, तदा
अन्तःप्रज्ञादित्वप्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणसमकालमेव
आत्मन्यनर्थप्रपञ्चनिवृत्तिलक्षणं फलं परिसमाप्तमिति तुरीयाधिगमे
प्रमाणान्तरं साधनान्तरं वा न मृग्यम् । रज्जुसर्पविवेकसमकाल इव
रज्ज्वां सर्पनिवृत्तिफले सति रज्ज्वधिगमस्य
Ma.Up. 7 Bh.

Like the (same) rope mistaken as snake, garland, etc., when the same Atman is mistaken as Antaḥprajña (conscious of the subjective) etc., in the three states associated with different characteristics, the knowledge, resulting from the negation of such attributes as the conscious of the subjective, etc., is the means of establishing the absolute absence of the unreal phenomena of the world (imagined) in Atman. As a matter of fact, the two results, namely, the negation of (superimposed) attributes and the disappearance of the

unreal phenomena happen at the same time. Therefore no additional instrument of knowledge or no other effort is to be made or sought after for the realisation of Turiya. With the cessation of the idea of the snake, etc., in the rope, the real nature of the rope becomes revealed and this happens simultaneously with the knowledge of the distinction between the rope and the snake.

त्वमर्थं प्रत्यगात्मानं पश्येदात्मानमात्मनि ।

वाक्यार्थं तत आत्मानं सर्वं पश्यति केवलम्

सर्वमात्मेति वाक्यार्थे विज्ञातेऽस्य प्रमाणतः ।

असत्त्वे ह्यन्यमानस्य विधिस्तं योजयेत् कथम्

UPS, Metrical 18.220-221

In oneself should one see Atman, the inner Atman which is denoted by [the word] "Thou." Thence one sees all to be Atman– that is, the One apart which is meant by the sentence ["Thou art That"]. **When the meaning of the sentence, viz. that all is Atman, has become known to one through the right means of knowledge, how can any injunction enjoin him to perform [any action], since the other means of knowledge are untrue?**

Section 75

References:

दृशिरूपे सदा नित्ये दर्शनादर्शने मयि ।

कथं स्यातां ततो नान्य इष्यतेऽनुभवस्ततः

UPS Metrical 12.9

Since I am always of the nature of the Seeing and constant, how is it possible for Me [sometimes] to see and [sometimes] not to see? Therefore, any apprehension [of the word] different from that is not accepted.

इतोऽन्योऽनुभवः कश्चिदात्मनो नोपपद्यते ।

अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातारमिति श्रुतेः

UPS Metrical 18.218

No Awareness of Atman other than this is possible, since the Sruti says, “It is not known by those who [say they] understand It” (Kena Up. 2.3) [and] “[By what, my dear, should one know] the knower?” (Br.Up. 2.4.14).

दृशिरेवानुभूयेत स्वेनैवानुभवात्मना ।
तदाभासतया जन्म धियोऽस्यान्भवः स्मृतः

UPS Metrical 18.202

It is only Itself that is aware of the Seeing, for Its nature is Awareness. The Awareness of this [inner Atman] is described as the intellect's coming into being as a possessor of Its reflection.

आत्मनः स्वरूपं ज्ञप्तिः न ततो व्यतिरिच्यते । अतो नित्यैव ।

तथापि बुद्धेरुपाधिलक्षणायाश्चक्षुरादिद्वारैर्विषयाकारपरिणामिन्याः ये शब्दाद्याकारावभासाः, ते आत्मविज्ञानस्य विषयभूता उत्पद्यमाना एव आत्मविज्ञानेन व्याप्ता उत्पद्यन्ते । तस्मादात्मविज्ञानावभास्याश्च ते विज्ञानशब्दवाच्याश्च धात्वर्थभूता आत्मन एव धर्मा विक्रियारूपा इत्यविवेकिभिः परिकल्प्यन्ते

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

To explain: Knowledge, which is the true natue of the Self, is inseparable from the Self, and so it is everlasting. Still, the intellect, which is the limiting adjunct (of the Self) becomes transformed into the shape of the objects while issuing out through the eyes etc. (for cognizing things). These configurations of the intellect in the shape of sound etc., remain objectively illumined by the Consciousness that is the Self, even when they are in an incipient state; and when they emerge as cognitions, they are still enlightened by that Consciousness. Hence these

semblances of Consciousness a Consciousness that is really the Self are imagined by the nondiscriminating poeple to be referable by the word knowledge bearing the root meaning (of the verb to know); to be attributes of the Soul Itself; and to be subject to mutation.

Section 76

References:

आत्मस्वरूपकथनानात्मप्रतिषेधवाक्यजनितविज्ञानव्यतिरेकेणार्थान्तरस्य कर्तव्यस्य मानसस्य बाह्यस्य वाभावात् । तत्र हि विधेः साफल्यम् , यत्र विधिवाक्यश्रवणमात्रजनितविज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण पुरुषप्रवृत्तिर्गम्यते – यथा 'दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां स्वर्गकामो यजेतऽ इत्येवमादौ । न हि दर्शपूर्णमासविधिवाक्यजनितविज्ञानमेव दर्शपूर्णमासानुष्ठानम् । तच्चाधिकाराद्यपेक्षानुभावि । न तु 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) इत्याद्यात्मप्रतिपादकवाक्यजनितविज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण दर्शपूर्णमासादिवत्पुरुषव्यापारः सम्भवति ; सर्वव्यापारोपशमहेतुत्वात्तद्वाक्यजनितविज्ञानस्य ।

न ह्युदासीनविज्ञानं प्रवृत्तिजनकम् ; अब्रह्मानात्मविज्ञाननिवर्तकत्वाच्च 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) इत्येवमादिवाक्यानाम् । न च तन्निवृत्तौ प्रवृत्तिरुपपद्यते, विरोधात्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Because except the knowledge that arises from the dictum setting forth the nature of the Self and refuting the non-Self, there is nothing to be done, either mentally or outwardly. An injunction is appropriate only where, over and above the knowledge that arises immediately from hearing a sentence of the nature of an injunction, an activity on the part of a man is easily understood, as in sentences like, 'One who desires heaven must perform the new and full moon sacrifices.' The knowledge arising from a sentence enjoining these sacrifices is certainly not the performance of them. This depends on considerations such as whether a person is entitled to perform them. But apart from the knowledge arising from such passages delineating the Self as, **'Not this, not this,' (Br.Up. 2.3.6) there is no scope for human activity as in the case of the new and full moon sacrifices etc., because that knowledge puts a stop to all activity. For a neutral knowledge cannot initiate any activity,** since such passages as, 'One only without a second,' and 'Thou art That' (Ch.Up. 6.8.7), merely remove the consciousness of any other entity but the Self or Brahman. And when this is gone, no activity is possible, for they are contradictory to each other.

आकाङ्क्षाभावाच्च भावनाभावः यदुक्तम् 'यजेतऽ इत्यादौ किम् ? केन ? कथम् ? इति भावनाकाङ्क्षायां फलसाधनेतिकर्तव्यताभिः आकाङ्क्षापनयनं यथा, तद्वदिहाप्यात्मविज्ञानविधावप्युपपद्यत इति – तदसत् ; 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) 'अनन्तरमबाह्यम्ऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) इत्यादिवाक्यार्थविज्ञानसमकालमेव सर्वाकाङ्क्षाविनिवृत्तेः

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Moreover, there being no curiosity to know, no effort is necessary. To be explicit: You said, in the effort in connection with injunctions such as, 'One should sacrifice,' there is the curiosity to know what the sacrifice is about, what its means are, and how it is to be performed, and it is satisfied by the mention of the goal, the means and the method of the sacrifice; similarly here too, in the injunction about the knowledge of the Self, those things are necessary. But you are wrong, for all curiosity is ended as soon as one knows the meaning of such texts as, 'One only without a second,' 'Thou art That,' (Ch.Up. 6.8.7) 'Not this, not this,' (Br.Up. 2.3.6) 'Without interior or exterior' (Br.Up. 2.5.19), and 'This self is Brahman' (Br.Up. 2.5.19).

ध्यानं चिन्तनं यद्यपि मानसम्,
तथापि पुरुषेण कर्तुमकर्तुमन्यथा वा कर्तुं शक्यम्, पुरुषतन्त्रत्वात् ।

ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणजन्यम् । प्रमाणं च यथाभूतवस्तुविषयम् ।
अतो ज्ञानं कर्तुमकर्तुमन्यथा वा कर्तुमशक्यम् । केवलं वस्तुतन्त्रमेव तत्; न चोदनातन्त्रम्, नापि पुरुषतन्त्रम् । तस्मान्मानसत्वेऽपि ज्ञानस्य महद्वैलक्षण्यम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

It is yet possible for a man to do it or not to do it or to do it in some other way, because it solely depends upon a man. Knowledge however is generated by the right means of knowledge. The right means of knowledge has concern with things as they actually exist,
And it is impossible to generate knowledge or not to generate it or to generate it in some other way (optionally), because **knowledge depends upon the existing thing itself, and not upon any injunction "or" upon a man (**kevalaṃ vastutantrameva tat; na codanātantram, nāpi puruṣatantram**). Therefore, knowledge though mental is greatly dissimilar (to meditation).**

या तु प्रसिद्धेऽग्नावग्निबुद्धिः, न सा चोदनातन्त्रा; नापि पुरुषतन्त्रा । किं तर्हि? प्रत्यक्षविषयवस्तु-तन्त्रैवेति ज्ञानमेवैतत्; न क्रिया – एवं सर्वप्रमाणविषय-वस्तुषु वेदितव्यम् । तत्रैवं सति यथाभूत-ब्रह्मात्मविषयमपि ज्ञानं न चोदनातन्त्रम् । तद्विषये लिङादयः श्रूयमाणा अपि अनियोज्यविषयत्वात् कुण्ठीभवन्ति उपलादिषु प्रयुक्तक्षुर-तैक्ष्ण्यादिवत्, अहेयानुपादेय-वस्तुविषयत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

But the conception of the ordinary fire as Agni is neither any thing which depends upon an injunction or on a

man, but something which depends on the thing (the fire) itself, and it is knowledge pure and simple and not action. In the case of all things which are objects of the right means of knowledge, one should understand similarly. This being so, the knowledge that the eternally existing Brahman is the Self, is not something which depends upon an injunction. So Brahman not being the object of an injunction, or not being an entity from which any thing can be discarded or to which any thing can be added, any imperative forms (of verbs) we see used in the scriptures, become as ineffective as when the sharp edge of a razor is employed on a stone.

इत्यतः पार्थगर्थ्यमेव उपासनावाक्यानां ब्रह्मवाक्यानां च न्याय्यम् ।
न एकवाक्यत्वम्

BSBh. 3.2.21

And hence it is logical (to understand) that the passages setting out deep meditations and passages purely dealing with Brahman as such, have different meanings and are not reconcilable.

Section 77

References:

न, तत्साक्षित्वेन प्रत्युक्तत्वात् । न ह्यहंप्रत्ययविषय-कर्तृव्यतिरेकेण तत्साक्षी सर्वभूतस्थः सम एकः कूटस्थनित्यः पुरुषो विधिकाण्डे तर्कसमये वा केनचिदधिगतः सर्वस्यात्मा

BSBh. 1.1.4

No, it is not so, because the Self is the immediate consciousness (Sākṣī) of that Jīva-Self which is the object of the notion of 'I' or 'Ego'. Now, because this Puruṣa who is the mere immediate consciousness, as distinguished from the agent who is the object of the notion of 'I' or 'Ego', which resides in all beings, is uniform, the only one (without a second), is eternally unchanging, is the Self of all, and is not understood by anybody either from the Vedic chapter on injunctions or from the science of reasoning (Nyāya).

तत्प्रत्यक्षविषयमेवेति चेत् । न ; वादिविप्रतिपत्तिदर्शनात् ।

न हि देहान्तरसम्बन्धिन आत्मनः प्रत्यक्षेणास्तित्वविज्ञाने लोकायतिका बौद्धाश्च नः प्रतिकूलाः स्युः नास्त्यात्मेति वदन्तः । न हि घटादौ प्रत्यक्षविषये कश्चिद्विप्रतिपद्यते, नास्ति घट इति ।

स्थाण्वादौ पुरुषादिदर्शनान्नेति चेत् । न ; निरूपितेऽभावात् ।

न हि प्रत्यक्षेण निरूपिते स्थाण्वादौ विप्रतिपत्तिर्भवति । वैनाशिकास्त्वहमिति प्रत्यये जायमानेऽपि देहान्तरव्यतिरिक्तस्य

नास्तित्वमेव प्रतिजानते । तस्मात्प्रत्यक्षविषयवैलक्षण्यात्
प्रत्यक्षान्नात्मास्तित्वसिद्धिः । तथानुमानादपि

श्रुत्या आत्मास्तित्वे लिङ्गस्य दर्शितत्वात् लिङ्गस्य च
प्रत्यक्षविषयत्वात् नेति चेत् ।

न ; जन्मान्तरसम्बन्धस्याग्रहणात् । आगमेन त्वात्मास्तित्वेऽवगते
वेदप्रदर्शितलौकिकलिङ्गविशेषैश्च, तदनुसारिणो
मीमांसकास्तार्किकाश्चाहंप्रत्ययलिङ्गानि च वैदिकान्येव
स्वमतिप्रभवाणीति कल्पयन्तो वदन्ति प्रत्यक्षश्चानुमेयश्चात्मेति

Br.Up. Upod Bh.

Objection: Is it not a matter of perception?
Reply: No, for we see the divergence of opinion among different schools. Were the existence of the self in a future body a matter of perception, the materialists and Buddhists would not stand opposed to us, saying that there is no self. For nobody disputes regarding an object of perception such as a jar, saying it does not exist.
Objection: You are wrong, since a stump, for instance, is looked upon as a man and so on.
Reply: No, for it vanishes when the truth is known. There are no more contradictory views when the stump, for instance, has been definitely known as such through perception. The Buddhists, however, in spite of the fact that there is the egoconsciousness, persistently deny the existence of the self other than the subtle body.

Therefore, being different from objects of perception, the existence of the self cannot be proved by this means. Similarly inference too is powerless.
Objection: No, since the Śruti (Veda) points out certain grounds of inference for the existence of the self, and these depend on perception, (these two are also efficient means of the knowledge of the self).
Reply: Not so, for the self cannot be perceived as having any relation to another life.
But when its existence has been known from the Śruti and from certain empirical grounds of inference cited by it, the Mīmāṃsakas and logicians, who follow in its footsteps, fancy that those Vedic grounds of inference such as the egoconsciousness are the products of their own mind and declare that the self is knowable through perception and inference.

Section 78

References:

किमात्मकं च पुनरिदं चैतन्यं मन्यते, यस्य भूतेभ्य उत्पत्तिमिच्छति -

इति परः पर्यनुयोक्तव्यः । न हि भूतचतुष्टय-व्यतिरेकेण लोकायतिकः किञ्चित् तत्त्वं प्रत्येति । यत् अनुभवनं भूतभौतिकानाम्, तत् चैतन्यमिति चेत् ।

तर्हि विषयत्वात् तेषाम् न तद्धर्मत्वमश्नुवीत । स्वात्मनि क्रिया-विरोधात् ।

न हि अग्निरुष्णः सन् स्वात्मानं दहति । न हि नटः शिक्षितः सन् स्वस्कन्धमधिरोक्ष्यति । न हि भूतभौतिकधर्मेण सता

चैतन्येन भूतभौतिकानि विषयीक्रियेरन् । न हि रूपादिभिः स्वरूपं पररूपं वा विषयीक्रियते । विषयीक्रियन्ते तु बाह्याध्यात्मिकानि भूतभौतिकानि चैतन्येन ।

अतश्च यथैव अस्या भूतभौतिक-विषयाया उपलब्धेः भावोऽभ्युपगम्यते । एवं व्यतिरेकोऽपि अस्यास्तेभ्यः अभ्युपगन्तव्यः । उपलब्धि-स्वरूप एव च न आत्मेति आत्मनो देहव्यतिरिक्तत्वम्

BSBh. 3.3.54

The opponent (of Vedānta) may well be counter-questioned as to what he considers to be the nature of this 'sentiency' which he prefers wishfully to hold as originating from the elements. The materialist does not recognize any entity (Tattva) as such, other than this quartette of elements (Earth, Water, Tejas, and Vāyu). Now if it be said (by the opponent) that the perception of the elements and their products, itself is 'sentiency', then inasmuch as they (i.e. the elements) are but the objects of such sentiency, sentiency cannot possibly be their attribute. Because action by an entity on itself, is contradictory as for instance, fire which is hot, cannot burn itself, nor can an actor (acrobat), be he ever so well

trained, be able to ride on his own shoulder. If sentiency be the attribute of elements and their products, they cannot be made the objects of such sentiency, nor can form (Rūpa) etc., make form etc. themselves. Or the form of any external and internal (bodily) elements and their products, their objects. Hence, inasmuch as we do in fact understand the existence of the perception of elements and their products. We must necessarily understand the separateness of such perception from such elements and their products. Now the Ātmā as we understand it (for us), is of the nature of perception, and hence of course, this Ātmā is an entity apart from the body.

अन्धः स्वप्नं पश्यन् दृष्टपूर्वमेव पश्यति, न
शाकद्वीपादिगतमदृष्टरूपम् ।
ततश्च एतत्सिद्धं भवति – यः स्वप्ने पश्यति दृष्टपूर्वं वस्तु, स एव पूर्वं विद्यमाने चक्षुषि अद्राक्षीत् , न देह इति । देहश्चेत् द्रष्टा, स येनाद्राक्षीत् तस्मिन्नुद्धृते चक्षुषि स्वप्ने तदेव दृष्टपूर्वं न पश्येत् ; अस्ति च लोके प्रसिद्धिः – पूर्वं दृष्टं मया हिमवतः शृङ्गम् अद्याहं स्वप्नेऽद्राक्षमिति उद्धृतचक्षुषामन्धानामपि ; तस्मात् अनुद्धृतेऽपि चक्षुषि, यः स्वप्नदृक् स एव द्रष्टा, न देह इत्यवगम्यते
Br.Up. 4.3.6 Bh.

A blind man dreaming sees only things that he has already seen, and not unfamiliar forms, which one would find in Śākadvīpa, for instance. This proves that he alone who sees in a dream only familiar things also saw things

before, while the eyes were there –and not the body. If the body were the seer, it would not see in a dream only familiar sights when the eyes, the instruments of its vision, are taken out. And we know that even blind men, who have had their eyes taken out, say, 'Today I saw in a dream the Himalayan peak that I had seen before.' Therefore, it is clear that it is not the body, but he who dreams, that also saw things when the eyes were intact.

न हि कालत्रयसम्बन्धिन्येकस्मिन्नन्वयिन्यसति । कूटस्थे वा सर्वार्थदर्शिनि ।
देश-काल-निमित्तापेक्ष-वासनाधीन-स्मृति-प्रतिसन्धानादि-व्यवहारः सम्भवति

BSBh. 2.2.31

In the absence of the existence of any connecting principle whose nature persists (in every effect) in relation to all the three times (i.e. the past, present and future), or in the absence of any unchangeable entity (such as the Self) as the witness of all entities. No transactions, such as remembrance, recognition etc., which are dependent upon the impressions on the mind, and which depend upon environment, time and cause are possible.

ननु विज्ञानस्य स्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तग्राह्यत्वे, तदप्यन्येन ग्राह्यं तदप्यन्येन – इत्यनवस्था प्राप्नोति ; अपि च प्रदीपवदवभासात्मकत्वाज्ज्ञानस्य ज्ञानान्तरं कल्पयतः

समत्वादवभास्यावभासकभावानुपपत्तेः कल्पनानर्थक्यमिति तदुभयमप्यसत् , विज्ञानग्रहणमात्र एव विज्ञानसाक्षिणो ग्रहणाकाङ्क्षानुत्पादादनवस्थाशङ्कानुपपत्तेः, साक्षिप्रत्यययोश्च स्वभाववैषम्यादुपलब्ध्युपलभ्यभावोपपत्तेः, स्वयंसिद्धस्य च साक्षिणोऽप्रत्याख्येयत्वात्

BSBh. 2.2.28

If you (the follower of Buddha) say that in case a cognition were to be apprehended by means of a thing apart from the cognition itself, that again will have to be apprehended by something else, and that again by still some other thing, and so a regressus ad infinitum would result, and besides, cognition, like a lamp, being self-illuminating, if it is imagined that for such cognition some other cognition is necessary, it would be a futile assumption, because, both the cognitions being similar, it would not be reasonably sustainable to hold that they have a relation between them, in which, one cognition is the illuminator and the other the object of such illumination.

Reply: Both these assumptions of yours are not valid, because when a cognition is cognized, no further expectation arises about the immediate witness of such cognition (i.e. the Self), requiring in its own turn, some other witness to apprehend this first immediate witness, and hence it is not reasonably sustainable to entertain a doubt that a regressus ad infinitum would result, as the

witness (i.e. the Self) and the cognition are of different nature, it is reasonably sustainable that there is a relation between them of one being the cognizer and the other being the object of cognition. Because the existence of this witness (i.e. the Self) cannot be denied, inasmuch as the **Self is self-proved.**

यश्चान्यः विज्ञानस्य ग्रहीता, स आत्मा ज्योतिरन्तरं विज्ञानात् । तदा अनवस्थेति चेत् ।
न ; ग्राह्यत्वमात्रं हि तद्ग्राहकस्य वस्त्वन्तरत्वे लिङ्गमुक्तं न्यायतः ; न तु एकान्ततो ग्राहकत्वे तद्ग्राहकान्तरास्तित्वे वा कदाचिदपि लिङ्गं सम्भवति ; तस्मात् न तदनवस्थाप्रसङ्गः । विज्ञानस्य व्यतिरिक्तग्राह्यत्वे करणान्तरापेक्षायाम् अनवस्थेति चेत् । न, नियमाभावात् – न हि सर्वत्र अयं नियमो भवति ; यत्र वस्त्वन्तरेण गृह्यते वस्त्वन्तरम् , तत्र ग्राह्यग्राहकव्यतिरिक्तं करणान्तरं स्यादिति नैकान्तेन नियन्तुं शक्यते, वैचित्र्यदर्शनात् ; कथम् ? घटस्तावत् स्वात्मव्यतिरिक्तेन आत्मना गृह्यते ; तत्र प्रदीपादिरालोकः ग्राह्यग्राहकव्यतिरिक्तं करणम् ; न हि प्रदीपाद्यालोकः घटांशः चक्षुरंशो वा ; घटवत् चक्षुर्ग्राह्यत्वेऽपि प्रदीपस्य, चक्षुः प्रदीपव्यतिरेकेण न बाह्यमालोकस्थानीयं किञ्चित्करणान्तरमपेक्षते ; तस्मात् नैव नियन्तुं शक्यते – यत्र यत्र व्यतिरिक्तग्राह्यत्वं तत्र तत्र करणान्तरं स्यादेवेति । तस्मात् विज्ञानस्य व्यतिरिक्तग्राहकग्राह्यत्वे न करणद्वारा अनवस्था, नापि ग्राहकत्वद्वारा कदाचिदपि उपपादयितुं शक्यते । तस्मात् सिद्धं विज्ञानव्यतिरिक्तमात्मज्योतिरन्तरमिति

Br.Up. 4.3.7 Bh.

And that other entity which reveals consciousness is the self– the intelligence which is different from that consciousness.

Objection: But that would lead to a regressus in infinitum.

Reply: No; it has only been stated on logical grounds that because consciousness is an object revealed by something, the latter must be distinct from that consciousness. Obviously, there cannot be any infallible ground for inferring that the self literally reveals the consciousness in question, or that, as the witness, it requires another agency to reveal it. Therefore, there is no question of a regressus in infinitum.

Objection: If consciousness is revealed by something else, some means of revelation is required, and this would again lead to a regressus in infinitum.

Reply: No, for there is no such restriction; it is not a universal rule. We cannot lay down an absolute condition that whenever something is revealed by another, there must be some means of revelation besides the two–that which reveals and that which is revealed, for we observe diversity of conditions. For instance, a jar is perceived by something different from itself, viz. the self; here light such as ihai of a lamp, which is other than the perceiving

subject and the perceived object, is a means. The light of the lamp etc. is neither a part of the jar nor of the eye, But though the lamp, like the jar, is perceived by the eye, the latter does not require any external means corresponding to the light, over and above the lamp (which is the object). Hence we can never lay down the rule that wherever a thing is perceived by something else, there must be some means besides the two. Therefore, if consciousness is admitted being revealed by a subject different from it, the charge of a regressus in infinitum, either through the means or through the perceiving subject (the self), is altogether untenable. Hence it is proved that there is another light, viz. the light of the self, which is different from consciousness.

यथा चैतन्यावभास्यत्वं घटस्य, तथा प्रदीपस्यापि चैतन्यावभास्यत्वमविशिष्टम्

यत्तूच्यते, प्रदीप आत्मानं घटं चावभासयतीति, तदसत् ; कस्मात् ? यदा आत्मानं नावभासयति, तदा कीदृशः स्यात् ।

न हि तदा प्रदीपस्य स्वतो वा परतो वा विशेषः कश्चिदुपलभ्यते ; स हि अवभास्यो भवति, यस्यावभासकसन्निधौ असन्निधौ च विशेष उपलभ्यते ; न हि प्रदीपस्य स्वात्मसन्निधिः असन्निधिर्वा शक्यः

कल्पयितुम् ; असति च कादाचित्के विशेषे, आत्मानं प्रदीपः प्रकाशयतीति मृषैवोच्यते

Br.Up. 4.3.7 Bh.

Objection: A jar, even though revealed by an intelligence, requires a light different from itself (to manifest it), while the lamp does not require another lamp. Therefore the lamp, although revealed by something else, reveals itself as well as the jar.

ननु यथा घटः चैतन्यावभास्यत्वेऽपि व्यतिरिक्तमालोकान्तरमपेक्षते । न त्वेवं प्रदीपः अन्यमालोकान्तरमपेक्षते ; तस्मात् प्रदीपः अन्यावभास्योऽपि सन् आत्मानं घटं च अवभासयति न, स्वतः परतो वा विशेषाभावात्

Br.Up. 4.3.7 Bh.

Objection: But do we not see that a lamp reveals itself? People do not use another light to see a lamp, as they do in the case of a jar etc. Therefore a lamp reveals itself.

Reply: No, for there is no difference as regards its being revealed by something else (the self). Although a lamp, being luminous, reveals other things, yet it is, just like a jar etc., invariably revealed by an intelligence other than itself. Since this is so, the lamp cannot but be revealed by something other than itself.

Section 79

References:

साक्षिणोऽवगन्तुः स्वयंसिद्धतामुपक्षिपता ।

स्वयं प्रथते विज्ञानम् इत्येष एव मम पक्षस्त्वया वाचोयुक्त्यन्तरेणाश्रित इति चेत्

न; विज्ञानस्योत्पत्तिप्रध्वंसानेकत्वादिविशेषवत्त्वाभ्युपगमात् ।

अतः प्रदीपवद्विज्ञानस्यापि व्यतिरिक्तावगम्यत्वमस्माभिः प्रसाधितम्

BSBh. 2.2.28

Objection: "You (the Vedāntin) who maintain that this witnessing Self is self-existing, practically in so many words accept my view, that cognition illumines itself, in a round-about way of reasoning".
Reply: No, because you (i.e. the follower of Buddha) hold that cognitions have particular attributes such as origination, destruction, and plurality, (while, we, the Vedāntins, recognize only the 'Self' which is eternal, unborn, indestructible). Hence, **we have thus established, that cognitions, like a lamp, are cognized by some one different from such cognitions.**

चैतन्यग्राह्यत्वं तु घटादिभिरविशिष्टं प्रदीपस्य । तस्माद् विज्ञानस्य आत्मग्राह्यग्राहकत्वे न प्रदीपो दृष्टान्तः । चैतन्यग्राह्यत्वं च विज्ञानस्य बाह्यविषयैः अविशिष्टम् ; चैतन्यग्राह्यत्वे च विज्ञानस्य,

किं ग्राह्यविज्ञानग्राह्यतैव किं वा ग्राहकविज्ञानग्राह्यतेति तत्र सन्दिह्यमाने वस्तुनि, योऽन्यत्र दृष्टो न्यायः, स कल्पयितुं युक्तः, न तु दृष्टविपरीतः ; तथा च सति यथा व्यतिरिक्तेनैव ग्राहकेण बाह्यानां प्रदीपानां ग्राह्यत्वं दृष्टम् , तथा विज्ञानस्यापि चैतन्यग्राह्यत्वात् प्रकाशकत्वे सत्यपि प्रदीपवत् व्यतिरिक्तचैतन्यग्राह्यत्वं युक्तं कल्पयितुम् , न तु अनन्यग्राह्यत्वम् ; यश्चान्यः विज्ञानस्य ग्रहीता, स आत्मा ज्योतिरन्तरं विज्ञानात्

Br.Up. 4.3.7 Bh.

But as regards being revealed by an intelligence the lamp is on a par with the jar etc. Therefore, the lamp is not an illustration in point to show that consciousness (of the intellect) reveals itself; it is revealed by an intelligence just as much as the external objects are. Now, if consciousness is revealed by an intelligence, which consciousness is it? – the one that is revealed (the consciousness of the intellect), or the one that reveals (i.e. the consciousness of the self)? Since there is a doubt on the point, we should infer on the analogy of observed facts, not contrary to them. Such being the case, just as we see those external objects such as a lamp are revealed by something different from them (the self), so also should consciousness – although it reveals other things like a lamp– be inferred, on the ground of its being revealed by an intelligence, to be revealed not by itself, but by an intelligence different from it. And that

other entity which reveals consciousness is the self– the intelligence which is different from that consciousness.

Section 80

References:

तयोः परिष्वक्तयोः अन्यः एकः क्षेत्रज्ञो लिङ्गोपाधिवृक्षमाश्रितः पिप्पलं कर्मनिष्पन्नं सुखदुःखलक्षणं फलं स्वादु अनेकविचित्रवेदनास्वादरूपं स्वादु अत्ति भक्षयत्युपभुङ्क्ते अविवेकतः ।
अनश्नन् अन्यः इतरः ईश्वरो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावः सर्वज्ञः सत्त्वोपाधिरीश्वरो नाश्नाति । प्रेरयिता
हृयसावुभयोर्भोज्यभोक्त्रोर्नित्यसाक्षित्वसत्तामात्रेण
Mund.Up. 3.1.1 Bh.

Of these two who hug this tree; the one (the individual soul) the knower of the field who clings to the tree of the subtle body that is its limiting adjunct; eats, enjoys, owing to nondiscrimination the fruit, consisting of happiness and misery brought about by action; which is full of tastes, consisting in the experience of multifarious mental reactions. Without tasting, the other, the Lord who is by nature eternal, pure, wise, and free, who is omniscient and has the totality of Maya as His limiting adjunct that Lord does not taste; for merely by His presence as the eternal witness, He is the director of both the enjoyer and the enjoyed.

तेनैव ह्यहंकर्त्रा अहंप्रत्ययविषयेण प्रत्ययिना सर्वाः क्रिया निर्वर्त्यन्ते । तत्फलं च स एवाश्नाति, 'तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति' (मुन्द्।उप्। ३।१।१) इति मन्त्रवर्णात् – 'आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिणः' (कथ्।उप्। १।३।४) इति च।

BSBh. 1.1.4

And all actions performed by him, who – as being the object of the terms 'I' and 'agent' – is the experiencer. And it is he alone that enjoys the fruit, according to the following scriptural mantras viz. "One of the two enjoys the delicious Pippala (fruit), and the other one (the Universal Self) refrains from enjoying and merely keeps looking on" (Mun.Up. 3.1.1), "When he is in union with the body, the senses and the mind, the wise people say that he is the experiencer" (Kath.Up. 1.3.4).

तं गुरुरुवाच -- न युक्तस्तव संशयः, यतस्तेषां प्रत्ययानां नियमेन अशेषतः उपलब्धेरेव अपरिणामित्वात् कूटस्थत्वसिद्धौ निश्चयहेतुमेव अशेषचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिं संशयहेतुमात्थ। यदि हि तव परिणामित्वं स्यात्, अशेषस्वविषयचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिर्न स्यात् चित्तस्येव स्वविषये यथा चेन्द्रियाणां स्वविषयेषु।

न च तथा आत्मनस्तव स्वविषयैकदेशोपलब्धिः । अतः कूटस्थतैव तवेति

UPS Prose 2.75

The teacher said to him, your doubt is not justifiable. For you, the Self, are proved to be free from change and therefore perpetually the same on the ground that all the

modifications of the mind without a single exception are (simultaneously) known by you. You regard this knowledge of all the modifications which is the reason for the above inference as that for your doubt. If you were changeful like the mind or the senses (which pervade their objects one after another), you would not simultaneously know all the mental modifications, the objects of your knowledge. Nor are you aware of a portion only of the objects of your knowledge (at a time). You are, therefore, absolutely changeless.

एवमहंप्रत्ययिनम् अशेषस्वप्रचारसाक्षिणि प्रत्यगात्मन्यध्यस्य तं च प्रत्यगात्मानं सर्वसाक्षिणं
तद्विपर्ययेणान्तःकरणादिष्वध्यस्यति

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

In this manner he superimposes that which experiences the 'I' or 'Ego' viz., the minds on the Universal Self which is a witness of all the processes of the mind,
And conversely superimposes the Universal Self on the internal sense-organ i.e. the mind.

Section 81

References:

किं द्वे दृष्टी द्रष्टुः – नित्या अदृश्या अन्या अनित्या दृश्येति ?

बाढम् ; प्रसिद्धा तावदनित्या दृष्टिः, अन्धानन्धत्वदर्शनात् ; नित्यैव चेत् , सर्वोऽनन्ध एव स्यात् ; द्रष्टुस्तु नित्या दृष्टिः – 'न हि द्रष्टुर्दृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । २३) इति श्रुतेः ; अनुमानाच्च – अन्धस्यापि घटाद्याभासविषया स्वप्ने दृष्टिरुपलभ्यते ; सा तर्हि इतरदृष्टिनाशे न नश्यति ; सा द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिः ; तया अविपरिलुप्तया नित्यया दृष्ट्या स्वरूपभूतया स्वयञ्ज्योतिःसमाख्यया इतरामनित्यां दृष्टिं स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोर्वासनाप्रत्ययरूपां नित्यमेव पश्यन्दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति । एवं च सति दृष्टिरेव स्वरूपमस्य अग्न्यौष्ण्यवत् , न काणादानामिव दृष्टिव्यतिरिक्तः अन्यः चेतनः द्रष्टा ॥

तद्ब्रह्म आत्मानमेव नित्यदृग्रूपमध्यारोपितानित्यदृष्ट्यादिवर्जितमेव अवेत् विदितवत्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: Has the seer then two kinds of vision, one eternal and invisible, and the other transitory and visible?

Reply: Yes. The transitory vision is familiar to us, for we see some people are blind, and others are not. If the eternal vision were the only one in existence, all people would be possessed of vision. But the vision of the seer is an eternal one, for the Sruti says, 'The vision of the witness can never be lost' (Br.Up. 4.3.23). From inference also we know this. For we find even a blind man has vision consisting of the impressions of a jar etc. in

dreams. This shows that the vision of the seer is not lost with the loss of the other kind of vision. Through that unfailing eternal vision, which is identical with It and is called the selfeffulgent light, the Self always sees the other, transitory vision in the dream and waking states, as idea and perception respectively, and becomes the seer of sight. Such being the case, the vision itself is Its nature, like the heat of fire, and there is no other conscious (or unconscious) seer over and above the vision, as the Vaisesikas maintain.

It, Brahman, knew only Itself, the eternal vision, devoid of the transitory vision etc. superimposed on It.

अथापि योऽस्मिन्देहे वेद ; कथम् ? इदं सुगन्धि दुर्गन्धि वा जिघ्राणीति अस्य गन्धं विजानीयामिति, स आत्मा, तस्य गन्धाय गन्धविज्ञानाय घ्राणम् ।

इदं सुगन्धि दुर्गन्धि वा जिघ्राणीति अस्य गन्धं विजानीयामिति, स आत्मा, तस्य गन्धाय गन्धविज्ञानाय घ्राणम् । अथ यो वेद इदं वचनम् अभिव्याहराणीति वदिष्यामीति, स आत्मा, अभिव्याहरणक्रियासिद्धये करणं वागिन्द्रियम् । अथ यो वेद – इदं शृणवानीति, स आत्मा, श्रवणाय श्रोत्रम् । अथ यो वेद – इदं मन्वानीति मननव्यापारमिन्द्रियासंस्पृष्टं केवलं मन्वानीति वेद, स आत्मा । मननाय मनः । यो वेद स आत्मेत्येवं सर्वत्र प्रयोगात् वेदनमस्य स्वरूपमित्यवगम्यते – यथा यः पुरस्तात्प्रकाशयति

सअदित्यः, यो दक्षिणतः यः पश्चात् उत्तरतो य ऊर्ध्वं प्रकाशयति स आदित्यः – इत्युक्ते प्रकाशस्वरूपः स इति गम्यते ।
दर्शनादिक्रियानिर्वृत्त्यर्थानि तु चक्षुरादिकरणानि

Chand.Up. 8.12.4-5 Bh.

Similarly, who knows in this body and how? 'I smell and know (whether) it smells sweet or smells foul'. It is the Self that knows thus. The nose is meant for his smelling, i.e. for his knowledge of the smell. And also he who knows 'I speak this' is the Self. The organ of speech is meant for the act of uttering. Similarly, he who knows 'I hear this', is the Self. The sense of hearing is for hearing. Then he who knows 'I think this' i.e., who thinks, 'Let me undertake those actions of the mind alone that are not associated with the external senses', is the Self.

The mind is the instrument for mental activity. Inasmuch as it is cited everywhere, 'He who knows is the Self, knowledge is said to be Its nature, even as from the description. 'That which illumines the east is the sun and that which illumines the south, the west, the north, and the upper region, is the sun', it becomes known that the sun is of the nature of light. The instruments such as the eye are meant to perform the act of seeing etc.

यथा बुद्ध्याद्याहृतस्य शब्दाद्यर्थस्य अविक्रिय एव सन् बुद्धिवृत्त्यविवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्यया उपलब्धा आत्मा कल्प्यते, एवमेव आत्मानात्मविवेकज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या विद्यया असत्यरूपयैव परमार्थतः अविक्रिय एव आत्मा विद्वानुच्यते

BGh. 2.21

Though the Self remains immutable, **due to ignorance and knowledge arising from an intellectual pursuit devoid of discrimination, it is said to be responsive to sensory objects** like sound etc., whereas (actually) the intellect (buddhi) alone is responsive (to sound etc. and not the Self). In the same manner by means of knowledge arising from ātmānātmaviveka (i.e. discrimination between the real and the unreal), though such an intellectual pursuit is ever of an unreal nature, the Self, even though immutable, is regarded as vidvan (knower).

आत्मनः सत्तामात्र एव ज्ञानकर्तृत्वम् , न तु व्यापृततया – यथा सवितुः सत्तामात्र एव प्रकाशनकर्तृत्वम् , न तु व्यापृततयेति – तद्वत्

Chand.Up. 8.12.5 Bh.

From the mere existence of the Self alone spring up knowledge and doership, but not by means of the activity (of the Self), even as the act of illumination results from

the mere existence of the sun itself, but not from the activity of the sun.

Section 82

References:

न हि दृष्ट्यादिधर्मभेदप्रदर्शनपरम् इदं वाक्यम् 'यद्वै तत्ऽ इत्यादि ; किं तर्हि, यदि चैतन्यात्मज्योतिः, कथं न जानाति सुषुप्ते ?

नूनम् अतो न चैतन्यात्मज्योतिः इत्येवमाशङ्काप्राप्तौ, तन्निराकरणाय एतदारब्धम् 'यद्वै तत्ऽ इत्यादि । यत् अस्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः चक्षुराद्यनेकोपाधिद्वारं चैतन्यात्मज्योतिःस्वाभाव्यम् उपलक्षितं दृष्ट्याद्यभिधेयव्यवहारापन्नम् , सुषुप्ते उपाधिभेदव्यापारनिवृत्तौ अनुद्भास्यमानत्वात् अनुपलक्ष्यमाणस्वभावमपि उपाधिभेदेन भिन्नमिव – यथाप्राप्तानुवादेनैव विद्यमानत्वमुच्यते , तत्र दृष्ट्यादिधर्मभेदकल्पना विवक्षितार्थानभिज्ञतया । सैन्धवघनवत् प्रज्ञानैकरसघनश्रुतिविरोधाच्च ; 'विज्ञानमानन्दम्ऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २८) 'सत्यं ज्ञानम्ऽ (तै। उ। २ । १ । १) 'प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्मऽ (ऐ। उ। ३ । १ । ३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यश्च ।

Br.Up. 3.3.30 Bh.

Surely then it must be otherwise. This is how it is being answered: Its natural selfluminous intelligence manifests itself in the waiting and dream states through many limiting adjuncts such as the eyes, and comes to be

designated as vision etc. But in the state of profound sleep, owing to the cessation of the different activities of the mind and organs, these latter do not appear, and therefore the nature of the self cannot be perceived as differentiated by them. Yet it is spoken of as being present in a way that is a mere recapitulation of normal experience. Hence the view that the passage in question presents the attributes such as vision as different from the self, is based on an ignorance of its true meaning.

Moreover, it would conflict with the Śruti text that speaks of the self as homogeneous Pure Intelligence, like a lump of salt, and also with texts like the following: 'Knowledge, Bliss' (Br.Up. 3.9.28), 'Truth, Knowledge' (Tai.Up. 2.1.1), and 'Intelligence is Brahman' (Ait. Up. 3.1.3).

दृष्टिः स्पृष्टिः श्रुतिर्घ्रातिर्मतिर्विज्ञातिरेव च ।

शक्तयोऽन्याश्च भिद्यन्ते चिद्रूपत्वेऽप्युपाधिभिः

UPS Metrical 17.53

Seeing, touching, hearing, smelling, thinking, knowing, and other powers, though they are of the nature of Pure Consciousness, are differentiated by limiting adjuncts.

शब्दप्रवृत्तेश्च – लौकिकी च शब्दप्रवृत्तिः – ‘चक्षुषा रूपं विजानातिऽ ‘श्रोत्रेण शब्दं विजानातिऽ ‘रसनेनान्नस्य रसं विजानातिऽ इति च सर्वत्रैव च दृष्ट्यादिशब्दाभिधेयानां विज्ञानशब्दवाच्यतामेव दर्शयति । शब्दप्रवृत्तिश्च प्रमाणम् । दृष्टान्तोपपत्तेश्च – यथा हि लोके स्वच्छस्वाभाव्ययुक्तः स्फटिकः तन्निमित्तमेव केवलं हरितनीललोहिताद्युपाधिभेदसंयोगात् तदाकारत्वं भजते, न च स्वच्छस्वाभाव्यव्यतिरेकेण हरितनीललोहितादिलक्षणा धर्मभेदाः स्फटिकस्य कल्पयितुं शक्यन्ते – तथा चक्षुराद्युपाधिभेदसंयोगात् प्रज्ञानघनस्वभावस्यैव आत्मज्योतिषः दृष्ट्यादिशक्तिभेद उपलक्ष्यते, प्रज्ञानघनस्य स्वच्छस्वाभाव्यात् स्फटिकस्वच्छस्वाभाव्यवत्

Br.Up. 3.3.30 Bh.

From the common use of words also we know this. We often use such expressions as, ‘One knows colour through the eyes,’ ‘One knows sound through the ears,’ ‘One knows the taste of food through the tongue,’ etc., which show that the objects denoted by the words ‘vision’ etc. can be designated as knowledge alone.
And the use of words is a means of knowledge.
Examples also support this view. Just as in the world a crystal is naturally transparent, and only for that reason assumes different colours by coming in contact with different limiting adjuncts such as green, blue, or red colour, and no one can imagine that crystal has any other attribute but its natural transparency, such as green, blue, or red colour, similarly the different powers of vision

etc. are observed in the light called the self, which is naturally Pure Intelligence, simply owing to its contact with the limiting adjuncts such as the eyes, because Pure Intelligence, like the crystal, is naturally transparent.

Section 83

References:

एवं सोम्य ते षोडशानां कलानामेका कलातिशिष्टाभूत्सान्नेनोपसमाहिता प्राज्वाली तयैतर्हि वेदाननुभवस्यन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वागिति तद्धास्य विजज्ञाविति विजज्ञाविति

Ch.Up. 6.7.6 (sruti)

'In the same way, O Somya, of your sixteen parts, only one remained. But that, when nourished by food, has revived, and by that you are now able to follow the Vedas. O Somya, this is why I said that the mind was nourished by food, prāṇa was nourished by water, and speech was nourished by fire.' Śvetaketu now understood what his father was saying.

एवम् देहादिसङ्घातस्यापि शब्दादिस्वरूपत्वाविशेषाद्विज्ञेयत्वाविशेषाच्च न युक्तं विज्ञातृत्वम् ।

यदि हि देहादिसङ्घातो रूपाद्यात्मकः सन् रूपादीन्विजानीयात् , तर्हि बाह्या अपि रूपादयोऽन्योन्यं स्वं स्वं रूपं च विजानीयुः । न चैतदस्ति । तस्माद्देहादिलक्षणांश्च रूपादीन् एतेनैव देहादिव्यतिरिक्तेनैव विज्ञानस्वभावेनात्मना विजानाति लोकः । यथा येन लोहो दहति सोऽग्निरिति तद्वत् आत्मनोऽविज्ञेयम् । किम् अत्र अस्मिंल्लोके परिशिष्यते न किञ्चित्परिशिष्यते सर्वमेव त्वात्मना विज्ञेयम् , यस्यात्मनोऽविज्ञेयं न किञ्चित्परिशिष्यते, स आत्मा सर्वज्ञः । एतद्वै तत्

Kath.Up. 2.1.3 Bh.

Since the aggregate of the body etc. is not distinguishable in its nature from sounds and the like and since it is of the nature of a knowable object, it is not correct to ascribe knowership to it. If the aggregate of the body etc., though of the nature of form etc., can perceive form vic., even external forms etc. should perceive as well the form of every other and their own. But it is not so. Therefore, the world perceives forms and the like in the form of the body etc. only by the Self which is distinct from the body etc, and which is of the nature of consciousness Itself, just as that by which the metal burns is said to be fire. What remains unknowable to the Self here in this world? Nothing remains, but everything can certainly be known by the Self. That Self is

omniscient to which nothing remains unknown. This verily is that.

न चास्ति शब्दादिरनन्यवेदनः परस्परेणापि न चैव दृश्यते ।
परेण दृश्यास्तु यथा रसादयस्तथैव दृश्यत्वत एव दैहिकाः
UPS Metrical 14.41
Sound and the other [external objects of knowledge] are not perceived by themselves, nor are they perceived by each other. Since taste, etc., are perceived by something other than themselves, they are objects of perception, and therefore belong to the body.

श्रोत्रं तावत्स्वविषयव्यञ्जनसमर्थं दृष्टम् । तत्तु स्वविषयव्यञ्जनसामर्थ्यं श्रोत्रस्य चैतन्ये ह्यात्मज्योतिषि नित्येऽसंहते सर्वान्तरे सति भवति, न असति इति । अतः श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रमित्याद्युपपद्यते
Ke.Up. 1.2 Bh.
The ear, to wit, is seen to be able to reveal its own object. This ability of the ear to reveal its own object is possible only when the eternal noncomposite, allpervading light of the Self is there, but not otherwise. Hence the expression, 'Ear of the ear' etc. is justifiable.

श्रोत्राद्येव सर्वस्यात्मभूतं चेतनामिति प्रसिद्धम् ; तदिह निवर्त्यते ।
अस्ति किमपि विद्वद्बुद्धिगम्यं सर्वान्तरतमं
कूटस्थमजमजरममृतमभयं श्रोत्रादेरपि श्रोत्रादि तत्सामर्थ्यनिमित्तम् इति प्रतिवचनं शब्दार्थश्चोपपद्यत एव ।
Ke.Up. 1.2 Bh.

It is a commonly accepted belief that the ears etc. constitute the Self of all, and that these are conscious. This is being refuted here. There does exist something which is known to the intellect of the men of realization, which dwells in the inmost recesses of all, which is changeless, undecaying, immortal, fearless, and unborn, and which is the Ear etc., of even the ear etc., i.e. the source of their capacity to act. Thus, the answer and significance of the words can certainly be justified.

तथा मनसः अन्तःकरणस्य मनः । न ह्यन्तःकरणम् अन्तरेण चैतन्यज्योतिषो दीधितिं स्वविषयसङ्कल्पाध्यवसायादिसमर्थं स्यात् । तस्मान्मनसोऽपि मन इति

Ke.Up. 1.2 Bh.

Similarly, manasah, of the mind, of the internal organ; (He is) Mind; because the internal organ is not able to perform its own functions thinking, determination, etc. unless it is illumined by the light of consciousness. Therefore He (Atman) is the Mind of the mind, too.

भानोर्बिम्बं यथा चौष्ण्यं जले दृष्टं न चाम्भसः ।
बुद्धौ बोधो न तद्धर्मस्तथैव स्याद् विधर्मतः

UPS Metrical 17.34

Just as the reflection and heat of the sun are perceived in the water but do not belong to the water, so knowledge [though]

in the intellect, is not a quality of it, since [it] differs in nature [from the intellect].

Section 84

References:

प्राणन्नेव प्राणनक्रियामेव कुर्वन् , प्राणो नाम प्राणसमाख्यः प्राणाभिधानो भवति ; प्राणनक्रियाकर्तृत्वाद्धि प्राणः प्राणितीत्युच्यते, नान्यां क्रियां कुर्वन् – यथा लावकः पाचक इति । तस्मात्क्रियान्तरविशिष्टस्यानुपसंहारादकृत्स्नो हि सः ।

तथा वदन् वदनक्रियां कुर्वन् , वक्तीति वाक् , पश्यन् चक्षुः, चष्ट इति चक्षुः द्रष्टा, शृण्वन् शृणोतीति श्रोत्रम् । 'प्राणन्नेव प्राणो वदन्वाक्ऽ इत्याभ्यां क्रियाशक्त्युद्भवः प्रदर्शितो भवति । 'पश्यंश्चक्षुः शृण्वञ्श्रोत्रम्ऽ इत्याभ्यां विज्ञानशक्त्युद्भवः प्रदर्श्यते, नामरूपविषयत्वाद्विज्ञानशक्तेः । श्रोत्रचक्षुषी विज्ञानस्य साधने, विज्ञानं तु नामरूपसाधनम् ; न हि नामरूपव्यतिरिक्तं विज्ञेयमस्ति ; तयोश्चोपलम्भे करणं चक्षुश्रोत्रे । क्रिया च नामरूपसाध्या प्राणसमवायिनी ; तस्याः प्राणाश्रयाया अभिव्यक्तौ वाक् करणम् । तथा पाणिपादपायूपस्थाख्यानि ; सर्वेषामुपलक्षणार्था वाक् । एतदेव हि सर्वं व्याकृतम् – 'त्रयं वा इदं नाम रूपं कर्मऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ६ । १) इति हि वक्ष्यति । मन्वानो मनः – मनुते इति ; ज्ञानशक्तिविकासानां साधारणं करणं मनः – मनुतेऽनेनेति ; पुरुषस्तु कर्ता सन्मन्वानो मन इत्युच्यते । तान्येतानि प्राणादीनि, अस्यात्मनः कर्मनामानि, कर्मजानि नामानि कर्मनामान्येव, न तु वस्तुमात्रविषयाणि ; अतो न

कृत्स्नात्मवस्त्ववद्योतकानि – एवं ह्यासावात्मा प्राणनादिक्रियया तत्तत्क्रियाजनितप्राणादिनामरूपाभ्यां व्याक्रियमाणोऽवद्योत्यमानोऽपि । स योऽतः अस्मात्प्राणनादिक्रियासमुदायात् , एकैकं प्राणं चक्षुरिति वा विशिष्टमनुपसंहृतेतरविशिष्टक्रियात्मकम् , मनसा अयमात्मेत्युपास्ते चिन्तयति, न स वेद न स जानाति ब्रह्म । कस्मात् ? अकृत्स्नोऽसमस्तः हि यस्मात् एष आत्मा, अस्मात्प्राणनादिसमुदायात् , अतः प्रविभक्तः, एकैकेन विशेषणेन विशिष्टः, इतरधर्मान्तरानुपसंहारात् – भवति । यावदयमेवं वेद – 'पश्यामिऽ 'शृणोमिऽ 'स्पृशामिऽ इति वा स्वभावप्रवृत्तिविशिष्टं वेद, तावदञ्जसा कृत्स्नमात्मानं न वेद

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

When It does the function of living, It is called the vital force. Because of doing this function only, and none other, the Self is called the vital force, from the derivative meaning of the term, as one is called a cutter or a cook. Therefore, not combining the other aspects doing other functions, It is incomplete. Similarly, when It speaks, the organ of speech (or speaker); when It sees, the eye, or seer; when It hears, the ear, or listener. In the two sentences, 'When It does the function of living, It is the vital force,' and 'When It speaks, the organ of speech,' the manifestation of its power of action is indicated. While the two sentences, 'When It sees, the eye' and 'When It hears, the ear,' indicate the manifestation of Its power of knowledge, for this is concerned with name and form.

The ear and the eye are the instruments of knowledge, which has name and form as its material, for there is nothing to be known except these two, and the ear and the eye are the instruments to perceive them. And action has name and form as its auxiliaries and inheres in the vital force; the organ of speech is the instrument to manifest this action inherent in the vital force. Likewise the Self is called the hand, the foot and the organs of excretion and generation, which are all suggested by the organ of speech. The whole differentiated universe is this much. It will be said later on, 'This (universe) indeed consists of three things: name, form and action' (Br.Up. 1.6.1). And when It thinks, the mind, that which thinks. The word 'mind' also means the common instrument of the different manifestations of the power of knowledge. But here it denotes the Self, the agent who thinks. These, the vital force etc., are merely Its names according to functions, not describing the Self as It is. Hence they do not express the entity of the Self as a whole. Thus the Self is differentiated by the activities of living etc. into name and form such as the vital force, which are engendered by those different activities, and is manifested at the same time (but not realised as a whole). He who meditates through his mind upon each of

this totality of aspects doing the functions of living etc., qualified as the vital force or the eye, without combining the other aspects doing particular functions–meditates that this is the Self, does not know Brahman. Why? For It, this Self, is incomplete, being divided from this totality of aspects doing the functions of living etc. by possessing a single characteristic, and not including the other characteristics. As long as the man knows the Self as such, as possessed of the natural functions, and thinks that It sees, hears or touches, he does not really know the whole Self.

कथं पुनः पश्यन्वेदेत्याह – आत्मेत्येव आत्मेति – प्राणादीनि विशेषणानि यान्युक्तानि तानि यस्य सः – आप्नुवंस्तान्यात्मेत्युच्यते । स तथा कृत्स्नविशेषोपसंहारी सन्कृत्स्नो भवति । वस्तुमात्ररूपेण हि प्राणाद्युपाधिविशेषक्रियाजनितानि विशेषणानि व्याप्नोति । तथा च वक्ष्यति – 'ध्यायतीव लेलायतीवऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ७) इति । तस्मादात्मेत्येवोपासीत । एवं कृत्स्नो ह्यसौ स्वेन वस्तुरूपेण गृह्यमाणो भवति कस्मात्कृत्स्न इत्याशङ्क्याह – अत्रास्मिन्नात्मनि, हि यस्मात् , निरुपाधिके, जलसूर्यप्रतिबिम्बभेदा इवादित्ये, प्राणाद्युपाधिकृता विशेषाः प्राणादिकर्मजनामाभिधेया यथोक्ता ह्येते, एकमभिन्नताम् , भवन्ति

प्रतिपद्यन्ते । 'आत्मेत्येवोपासीतऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । ७) इति नापूर्वविधिः, पक्षे प्राप्तत्वात् । 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ४

। १), (बृ। उ। ३ । ५ । १) 'कतम आत्मेति – योऽयं विज्ञानमयः (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ७) इत्येवमाद्यात्मप्रतिपादनपराभिः श्रुतिभिरात्मविषयं विज्ञानमुत्पादितम्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Through what kind of vision can he know It? This is being explained: The Self alone is to be meditated upon. That which possesses the characteristics such as living that have been mentioned–includes them–is the Self. Combining all the characteristics, It then becomes the whole. It is as the Reality that It includes those characteristics due to the functions of particular limiting adjuncts such as the vital force. As it will be said later on, 'It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were' (Br.Up. 4.3.7). Therefore, the Self alone is to be meditated upon. When perceived thus as the Reality, It becomes complete. How is It complete? This is being answered: For all these differences due to the limiting adjuncts such as the vital force and denoted by names arising from the functions of living etc., as described above, are unified in It, become one with the unconditioned Self, as the different reflections of the sun in water become one in the sun. 'The Self alone is to be meditated upon'–this is not an original injunction (but a restrictive one), for meditation on the Self is known as a possible alternative. (In fact, neither injunction is necessary on the point, for

this meditation is inevitable, in the following way:) The knowledge of the Self has been imparted by such Śruti passages dealing with the subject as, 'The Brahman that is immediate and direct' (Br.Up. 3.4.1, Br.Up. 3.5.1), 'Which is the Self? This (infinite entity) that is identified with the intellect,' etc. (Br.Up. 4.37).

Section 85

References:

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ।

कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च

Sv.Up. 6.11 (sruti)

The Lord, who is one only, is hidden in all beings. He is all-pervading and is the inner self of all creatures. He presides over all actions, and all beings reside in Him. He is the witness, and He is the Pure Consciousness free from the three Gunas of Nature.

यथामबुद्धिचाराणां साक्षी तद्वत् परेष्वपि ।

नैवापोढुं न वादातुं शक्यस्तस्मात् परो ह्यहम्

UPS Metrical 7.2

Just as [I] am the Witness of the movements in My own intellect, so am I [also the Witness of the movements] in others [intellects]. I can be neither rejected nor accepted. Therefore, I am indeed the highest [Atman].

उपाधितन्त्रो हि जीव इत्युक्तम् । उपाध्यसन्तानाच्च नास्ति जीवसन्तानः -

ततश्च कर्मव्यतिकरः फलव्यतिकरो वा न भविष्यति

BSBh. 2.3.49

It has been said already that the Jīva-Self is subject to limiting adjuncts, and because of these limiting adjuncts not being comprehensive and constant (Asantānāt), there could be no simultaneous connection of the Jīva-Self with all bodies. And hence there could not be any confusion of actions or confusion of fruits of actions.

Section 86

References:

शमविधिपरम्; यत्कारणम् 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत' इत्याह । एतदुक्तं भवति - यस्मात्सर्वमिदं विकारजातं ब्रह्मैव, तज्जत्वात् तल्लत्वात् तदनत्वाच्च -

BSBh 1.2.1

It has the purport of giving an injunction to be calm and collected, because it is said, “All this verily is Brahman, and therefore being calm and collected one should meditate devoutly on Tajjalān as that.” It means to say – because all this, which is a modification (as from a cause), is in substance Brahman only, and because it is Tajjalān (Taj-ja-la-an, i.e. from which all things spring up, in which all things end, and in which all things live),

आरम्भणशब्दस्तावदेकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाय दृष्टान्तापेक्षायामुच्यते – ‘ यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञात स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ४) इति ; एतदुक्तं भवति – एकेन मृत्पिण्डेन परमार्थतो मृदात्मना विज्ञातेन सर्वं मृन्मयं घटशरावोदञ्चनादिकं मृदात्मकत्वाविशेषाद्विज्ञातं भवेत् ; यतो वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम् – वाचैव केवलमस्तीत्यारभ्यते – विकारः घटः शराव उदञ्चनं चेति ; न तु वस्तुवृत्तेन विकारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति ; नामधेयमात्रं ह्येतदनृतम् ; मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् – इति एष ब्रह्मणो दृष्टान्त आम्नातः ; तत्र श्रुताद्वाचारम्भणशब्दाद्दार्ष्टान्तिकेऽपि ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेण कार्यजातस्याभाव इति गम्यते

BSBh 2.1.14

As for this word ‘Ārambhaṇa’, the scriptures, after declaring that by knowing the one (i.e. Brahman) everything else becomes known, and with a desire to cite

an illustration, say – “Oh mild one, just as by knowing one clod of earth, everything that is made of earth becomes known. The effect (viz. a pot etc.) is merely a name made current by speech, while that it is earth merely, is the truth” (Chan.Up. 6.1.1). By this is meant that when a clod of earth is understood to be in essence but mere earth only, all things made of earth such as a jar, a trough and a water-pot, automatically become known, because, having the earth as their Self is common (to them all), and hence it is (that it is said) that an effect is merely a name made current (Ārabhyate, ‘originated’) by speech, and its existence as an effect is because of speech only. The effect viz. a jar or a trough or a water-pot is not in existence substantially as an effect as such, but is merely a name, and is false or untrue, and that it merely is but earth only, is the truth. This is stated as an illustration of Brahman. Therefore, because of the word ‘Ārambhaṇa’ occurring in the scriptures, it is understood that, in the case of the thing illustrated also, all creation as a class as such, has no existence as apart from Brahman.

Section 87

References:

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धैरजातेस्त्रसतां सदा

Ma.Up. Ka. 4.42 (karika)

Wise men support causality only for the sake of those who, being afraid of absolute nonmanifestation (of things), stick to the (apparent) reality of (external) objects on account of their perception (of such objects) and their faith in religious observances.

यापि बुद्धैः अद्वैतवादिभिः जातिः देशिता उपदिष्टा, उपलम्भनमुपलम्भः, तस्मात् उपलब्धेरित्यर्थः । समाचारात् वर्णाश्रमादिधर्मसमाचरणाच्च ताभ्यां हेतुभ्याम् अस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् अस्ति वस्तुभाव इत्येवंवदनशीलानां दृढाग्रहवतां श्रद्दधानां मन्दविवेकिनामर्थोपायत्वेन सा देशिता जातिः तां गृह्णन्तु तावत् । वेदान्ताभ्यासिनां तु स्वयमेव अजाद्वयात्मविषयो विवेको भविष्यतीति । न तु परमार्थबुद्ध्या

Ma.Up. Ka. 4.42 Bh.

For those aspirants who, for reasons of their perception and right conduct, i.e. right observance of the principles enjoined on the institution of caste and (the four) stages of life, etc., that is to say, for those two resons, assert

the existence of substantiality – for the benefit of those who are firm in their views, who are endowed with faith, and whose power of discrimination is rather dull, instruction regarding the birth (creation) referred to above, has been imparted by the wise, i.e by the non-dualists, by way of means for the development of discrimination (with the intention), “Let them grasp this for the present; as they advance in the practice of Vedanta, there will be (in them), in due course, the rise of discrimination pertaining to the Self that is unborn and non-dual”, but it is not imparted from the point of view of supreme reality.

Section 88

References:

अस्य जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्गं यतः सर्वज्ञात्सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद्भवति, तद्ब्रह्मेति वाक्यशेषः । अन्येषामपि भावविकाराणां त्रिष्वेवान्तर्भाव इति जन्मस्थितिनाशानामिह ग्रहणम् । यास्कपरिपठितानां तु ‘जायतेऽस्तिऽ इत्यादीनां ग्रहणे तेषां जगतः स्थितिकाले सम्भाव्यमानत्वान्मूलकारणादुत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशा जगतो न गृहीताः स्युरित्याशङ्क्येत ; तन्मा शङ्कि ; इति या उत्पत्तिर्ब्रह्मणः , तत्रैव स्थितिः प्रलयश्च, त एव गृह्यन्ते । न च यथोक्तविशेषणस्य जगतो

यथोक्तविशेषणमीश्वरं मुक्त्वा, अन्यतः प्रधानादचेतनात् अणुभ्यः अभावात् संसारिणो वा उत्पत्त्यादि सम्भावयितुं शक्यम् । न च स्वभावतः, विशिष्टदेशकालनिमित्तानामिहोपादानात्

BSBh. 1.1.2

The omniscient and all-powerful cause from which (Yataḥ), the origin, preservation and dissolution of this transient world, which is distinguished by names and forms, and which is connected with diverse agents and enjoyers, springs, and which is the basis of the fruit of actions depending upon a particular environment, time, and cause, and in even the mere thinking about which, imagination boggles and is unable to comprehend the arrangement, 'That is Brahman' which is to be understood as the complementary portion of the Sūtra. These three only viz. the origin, preservation and dissolution, are to be understood here, as the other modifications of existence are covered by these three. If we include the other modifications of existence enumerated by Yāska, we may be tempted to doubt the origin, preservation and dissolution as originating from the root-cause, as they (i.e. other modifications) are possible only when the transient world is in existence. In order that we should not doubt that the preservation and dissolution is of that only which is created, we should understand only these three (by the

word Janmādi). It is not possible to conceive the origin etc. of this transient world of the type described (above) to be from any cause other than the Lord described as above, viz. from the non-sentient Pradhāna (of the Sāṅkhyas) or from the atoms (of the Vaiśeṣikas), or from mere non-existence (as held by the followers of Buddha), or from a transmigratory being (such as Hiraṇyagarbha).

Nor can it ever evolve from its own nature (without any cause), for in such a matter, particular environment, time and cause have to be considered to be necessary.

न सांख्यपरिकल्पितमचेतनं प्रधानं जगतः कारणं शक्यं वेदान्तेष्वाश्रयितुम् । अशब्दं हि तत् । कथमशब्दत्वम्? ईक्षतेः ईक्षितृत्वश्रवणात्कारणस्य

BSBh. 1.1.5

In Vedānta, it is not possible to accept the non-intelligent Pradhāna as contemplated by the Sāṅkhyas, to be the cause of the transient world. It is not mentioned in the scriptures. How is it not mentioned in the scriptures? Because of the word ‘thinking’. Because the scriptures refer to ‘thinking’ on the part of the cause (of the transient world).

यतः यस्मात् वा इमानि ब्रह्मादीनि स्तम्बपर्यन्तानि भूतानि जायन्ते, येन जातानि जीवन्ति प्राणान्धारयन्ति वर्धन्ते, विनाशकाले च यत्प्रयन्ति यद्ब्रह्म प्रतिगच्छन्ति, अभिसंविशन्ति तादात्म्यमेव प्रतिपद्यन्ते, उत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकालेषु यदात्मतां न जहति भूतानि, तदेतद्ब्रह्मणो लक्षणम्

Tai.Up. 3.1 Bh.

That from which, indeed; all these beings starting with Brahma and ending with a clump of grass take birth; being born; that by which they live, grow; that Brahman towards which they proceed; into which they enter, become fully identified, at the time of their dissolution that with which the beings do not lose their identity during the times of creation, existence, and dissolution. This, then, is the definition of Brahman.

एवं हि श्रूयते - 'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छ।उप्। ६।२।१) इत्युपक्रम्य 'तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्राजायेयेति तत्तेजोऽसृजत' (छ। उप्। ६।२।३) इति।

BSBh. 1.1.5

Because the Scriptures, beginning with – "O Saumya, in the beginning 'Sat' alone without a second, was all this (i.e. the transient world)" (Chan.Up. 6.2.1) –

Say further – “that Sat thought, I shall make myself many and create, and it created Tejas (the element of heat and light)” (Chan.Up. 6.2.3).

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत् । नान्यत्किञ्चन मिषत् । स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति

Ait.Up. 1.1.1 (sruti)

In the beginning this was but the absolute Self alone. There was nothing else whatsoever that winked. He thought, "Let Me create the worlds."

स ईक्षाञ्चक्रे कस्मिन्नहमुत्क्रान्त उत्क्रान्तो भविष्यामि कस्मिन्वा प्रतिष्ठिते प्रतिष्ठास्यामीति ।

स प्राणमसृजत प्राणाच्छ्रद्धा खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवीन्द्रियं मनः । अन्नमन्नाद्वीर्यं तपो मन्त्राः कर्म लोका लोकेषु च नाम च

Pr.Up. 6.3-4 (sruti)

He deliberated: “As a result of whose departure shall I rise up? And as a result of whose continuance shall I remain established? ”He created Prana; from Prana (He created) faith, space, air, fire, water, earth, organs, mind, food; from food (He created) vigour, selfcontrol, mantras, rites, worlds and name in the worlds.

यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः ।

तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते

Mund.Up. 1.1.9 (sruti)

From Him, who is omniscient in general and allknowing in detail and whose austerity is constituted by knowledge, evolve this (derivative) Brahman, name, colour and food.

Section 89

References:

न ह्ययप्रत्यक्षं रूपादिहीनं च प्रधानमीश्वरस्याधिष्ठेयं सम्भवति ।

मृदादिवैलक्षण्यात्

BSBh. 2.2.39

It is not possible that the Lord can work by having the Pradhāna (as his material) as the Pradhāna (according to them) is devoid of any form and is not capable of being perceived. And because of its being quite dissimilar to earth etc.

साधिष्ठानो हि लोके सशरीरो राजा राष्ट्रस्येश्वरो दृश्यते, न निरधिष्ठानः ; अतश्च तद्दृष्टान्तवशेनादृष्टमीश्वरं कल्पयितुमिच्छतः ईश्वरस्यापि किञ्चिच्छरीरं करणायतनं वर्णयितव्यं स्यात् ; न च तद्वर्णयितुं शक्यते, सृष्ट्युत्तरकालभावित्वाच्छरीरस्य,

प्राक्सृष्टेस्तदनुपपत्तेः ; निरधिष्ठानत्वे चेश्वरस्य प्रवर्तकत्वानुपपत्तिः, एवं लोके दृष्टत्वात् । ‘ करणवच्चेन्न भोगादिभ्यःऽ – अथ लोकदर्शनानुसारेण ईश्वरस्यापि किञ्चित्करणानामायतनं शरीरं कामेन कल्प्येत – एवमपि नोपपद्यते ; सशरीरत्वे हि सति संसारिवद्भोगादिप्रसङ्गात् ईश्वरस्याप्यनीश्वरत्वं प्रसज्येत

BSBh. 2.2.40

In the ordinary world, for instance, it is as one possessing the support of a body, that a king is observed to be the ruler of the nation, and not as one without any such physical basis, so, he who would infer the Lord on the strength of such parallel instance would have to explain how the Lord comes to be possessed of a body as an abode of the sense-organs. But it is not possible to explain it that way, because a body can come into existence only after creation takes place, and prior to such creation, the existence of a body is not reasonably sustainable and if the Lord has no such physical basis (such as a body) it is not reasonably sustainable that he could be the promoter (of the world), because that is how it is observed to be, in the ordinary world. As regards the present Sūtra (it is said) – Now, if on the analogy of what is observed in the ordinary world, it is imagined, that the Lord has, at his own will, equipped himself with a body to serve as an abode for the sense-organs, even

this is not reasonably sustainable, because supposing the Lord does possess a body, then, as in the case of an ordinary person in the condition of transmigratory existence there would be the predicament of the Lord being liable to experience pleasure and pain, quite as much as such a man is, and it would then mean that the Lord also would be rendered quite unlordlike.

यद्धि लोके इयत्तापरिच्छिन्नं वस्तु घटादि । तदन्तवद्दृष्टम् -

तथा प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरत्रयमपीयत्तापरिच्छिन्नत्वादन्तवत्स्यात्

BSBh. 2.2.41

In the ordinary world, whatever has definite ascertained dimension i.e., limit – say, for instance, a piece of cloth etc. – Is seen to be liable to come to an end. Similarly, therefore, this trio of the Pradhāna, the Puruṣa and the Lord having a definite ascertained dimension i.e., limit, they would be rendered as being liable to come to an end.

अभिध्योपदेशश्चात्मनः कर्तृत्वप्रकृतित्वे गमयति 'सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (तै।उप्। २।६।१) इति, 'तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (तैत्।उप् २।६।१) इति च।

तत्राभिध्यानपूर्विकायाः स्वातन्त्र्यप्रवृत्तेः कर्तेति गम्यते

BSBh. 1.4.24

The instruction about desire also, as for instance, the Scriptural passages such as "He desired, may I be many and may I give birth (to Prajās)", "He thought, may I be many and may I give birth (to Prajās)", indicate its being the material and the accidental cause also. Here, it is understood that it is the accidental cause i.e. the agent, because of the independent activity preceded by desire.

इतश्च प्रकृतिर्ब्रह्म, यत्कारणं साक्षाद्ब्रह्मैव कारणमुपादाय उभौ प्रभवप्रलयावाम्नायेते - 'सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति' (छन्।उप्। १।९।१) इति । यद्धि यस्मात्प्रभवति, यस्मिंश्च प्रलीयते तत्तस्योपादानं प्रसिद्धम् । यथा व्रीहियवादीनां पृथिवी

BSBh. 1.4.25

Brahman is the material cause, because Brahman has been directly accepted as the cause of both the creation and its ultimate dissolution, by the scriptures, thus – "Verily, all these things are born of the Ākāśa alone, and have their final dissolution in it" (Chan.Up. 1.9.1). It is

quite well-known, that that from which any thing is born and in which it ultimately is dissolved, is the material cause. Just as, for instance, the Earth (is the material cause) of rice and barley.

यत्कारणं ब्रह्मप्रक्रियायाम् 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुतऽ (तै। उ। २ । ७ । १) इत्यात्मनः कर्मत्वं कर्तृत्वं च दर्शयति – आत्मानमिति कर्मत्वम् , स्वयमकुरुतेति कर्तृत्वम् । कथं पुनः पूर्वसिद्धस्य सतः कर्तृत्वेन व्यवस्थितस्य क्रियमाणत्वं शक्यं सम्पादयितुम् ? परिणामादिति ब्रूमः – पूर्वसिद्धोऽपि हि सन्नात्मा विशेषेण विकारात्मना परिणमयामासात्मानमिति । विकारात्मना च परिणामो मृदाद्यासु प्रकृतिषूपलब्धः ; स्वयमिति च विशेषणान्निमित्तान्तरानपेक्षत्वमपि प्रतीयते

BSBh. 1.4.26

The scriptural passage in which creation by Brahman is mentioned thus – "It alone created itself" (Tait.Up. 2.7), shows the Self to be both the agent and the object. 'Created itself' shows its being the object (Karmatva) and 'It alone' shows its being the agent.

Objection: How ever can the 'Self', existing already and known to be the agent, be construed to be the object to be produced also?

Reply: Through modification (Pariṇāma). Already in existence as the Self is before creation, it causes itself to undergo modification, as the Self of the modification. It is patent how there is modification of material causes such as clay etc. We understand from the word 'itself', how there is no expectation of any other accidental cause.

कालः स्वभावो नियतिर्यदृच्छा भूतानि योनिः पुरुष इति चिन्त्या ।

संयोग एषां न त्वात्मभावा-दात्माप्यनीशः सुखदुःखहेतोः

Sv.Up. 1.2 (sruti)

Time, inherent nature, fate, chance, the elements, the individual soul, as the source, need consideration. But their combination is not (the source) beacuse they exist for the soul. The soul (individual), too, is not independent on account of joy and sorrow.

Section 90

References:

दृश्यते हि लोके – चेतनत्वेन प्रसिद्धेभ्यः पुरुषादिभ्यो विलक्षणानां केशनखादीनामुत्पत्तिः, अचेतनत्वेन च प्रसिद्धेभ्यो गोमयादिभ्यो वृश्चिकादीनाम् । नन्वचेतनान्येव पुरुषादिशरीराण्यचेतनानां केशनखादीनां कारणानि, अचेतनान्येव च वृश्चिकादिशरीराण्यचेतनानां

गोमयादीनां कार्याणीति । उच्यते – एवमपि किञ्चिदचेतनं चेतनस्यायतनभावमुपगच्छति किञ्चिन्नेत्यस्त्येव वैलक्षण्यम् । महांश्चायं पारिणामिकः स्वभावविप्रकर्षः पुरुषादीनां केशनखादीनां च स्वरूपादिभेदात् , तथा गोमयादीनां वृश्चिकादीनां च

BSBh. 2.1.6

We find in the ordinary world that from men etc., who are known to be sentient, hair, nails etc. which are dissimilar to them are produced. And scorpions etc. are produced from cowdung etc. which are known to be non-sentient.

Objection: But we have said already that it is the non-sentient bodies of men etc. which are the cause of the non-sentient hair, nails, etc. and the non-sentient bodies of the scorpions etc. that are the effects of the nonsentient cow-dung etc.

Reply: But even then, dissimilarity does still persist, in as much as some non-sentient things only, constitute the basis for sentient things, while some do not. Great indeed is this disparity of nature, due to modification (of cause into effect), between men etc., and hair and nails etc., because of dissimilarity of form etc. between them, and similarly also between cowdung and scorpions etc.

विलक्षणत्वेन च कारणेन ब्रह्मप्रकृतिकत्वं जगतो दूषयता किमशेषस्य ब्रह्मस्वभावस्याननुवर्तनं विलक्षणत्वमभिप्रेयते, उत यस्य कस्यचित् , अथ चैतन्यस्येति वक्तव्यम् । प्रथमे विकल्पे समस्तप्रकृतिविकारभावोच्छेदप्रसङ्गः ; न ह्यसत्यतिशये प्रकृतिविकार इति भवति । द्वितीये चासिद्धत्वम् ; दृश्यते हि सत्तालक्षणो ब्रह्मस्वभाव आकाशादिष्वनुवर्तमान इत्युक्तम् । तृतीये तु दृष्टान्ताभावः ; किं हि यच्चैतन्येनानन्वितं तदब्रह्मप्रकृतिकं दृष्टमिति ब्रह्मकारणवादिनं प्रत्युदाह्रियेत, समस्तस्य वस्तुजातस्य ब्रह्मप्रकृतिकत्वाभ्युपगमात्

BSBh. 2.1.6

Now you, who wish to vitiate the doctrine of the world having Brahman as to its material cause, on the ground of dissimilarity, have to say, whether by dissimilarity, you mean the non-appearance of the total comprehensive nature of Brahman (in the effect i.e. the world), or the non-appearance of any particular nature, or the nonappearance of the nature of sentiency. In the case of the first alternative, there would be the predicament of the complete destruction of the relationship of cause and effect as between them, because, in the absence of there being something extra (in an effect), there would be no such thing as cause and effect. As regards the second alternative, it cannot be substantiated, because it has already been said that the nature of ‘existence as such’

(Sattā) inherent in Brahman (the cause) is seen to reappear in Ākāśa etc. (the effects) So far as the third alternative is concerned, there is absence of any illustration (to prove it). To what entity – which is at once non-sentient but which is not seen to have Brahman as its cause – can you possibly refer to (as actually existing), as an illustration (of your alternative), in answer to the doctrine of a follower of Vedānta (i.e. Brahmavādin) who holds that all things have Brahman as their cause?

योऽपि चेतनकारणश्रवणबलेनैव समस्तस्य जगतश्चेतनतामुत्प्रेक्षेत ।

तस्यापि 'विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च' (तैत्।उप्। २।६।१) इति चेतनाचेतनविभागश्रवणं

विभावनाविभावनाभ्यां चैतन्यस्य शक्यत एव योजयितुम्

BSBh. 2.1.6

He, who, on the strength of the scriptures that speak of a sentient cause, conjectures that the whole world is sentient, may be able to explain the division into sentient and non-sentient as referred to by the scriptures in "He becomes knowledge (Vijñāna), and becomes that which is not-knowledge (Avijñāna)" as being due to the manifestation or the absence of manifestation of sentiency.

तत्र यथा चेतनस्याचेतनभावो नोपपद्यते विलक्षणत्वात् । एवमचेतनस्यापि चेतनभावो नोपपद्यते । प्रत्युक्तत्वात्तु विलक्षणत्वस्य यथा श्रुत्यैव चेतनं कारणं ग्रहीतव्यं भवति

BSBh. 2.1.6

So, as according to him, by reason of dissimilarity, it is not reasonably possible to consider, that a sentient cause can become a non-sentient effect. Similarly, a non-sentient cause (such as Pradhāna) also, cannot modify itself into a sentient effect. Therefore, as the objection based on dissimilarity thus stands refuted, (the view) that the cause (of the world) is sentient as spoken of by Scriptures, has necessarily to be accepted.

Section 91

References:

क्षीरवत् सर्वपरिणामपक्षे सर्वश्रुतिस्मृतिकोपः, स च अनिष्टः । 'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम्ऽ (श्वे। ६ । १९) 'दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजःऽ (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) 'आकाशवत्सर्वगतश्च नित्यःऽ (शत। ब्रा। १० । ६ । ३ । २) 'स वा एष महानज आत्माजरोऽमरोऽमृतःऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २५) 'न जायते म्रियते वा कदाचित्ऽ (भ। गी। २ । २०) 'अव्यक्तोऽयम्ऽ (भ। गी। २ । २५) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायविरुद्धा एते सर्वे पक्षाः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

As regards the view which expresses the transformation of the entire supreme Self like milk etc, since it is opposed to all the srutis and smritis, it is not desirable. All these views are opposed to the sruti, smriti and reasoning as could be seen from, Without parts, without activity and serene' (Sv.Up. 6.9), 'Purusha is indeed resplendent and without form and is both without and within, and unborn' (Mun.Up. 2.1.2), 'All-pervading like akasa and eternal', 'That great, unborn Self is Brahman, undecaying, immortal, undying' (Br.Up. 4.4.25), 'This Self is never born nor ever dies' (Gita 2.20) 'This Self is unmanifest etc. (Gita 2.25).

यथैव हि ब्रह्मणो जगदुत्पत्तिः श्रूयते, एवं विकारव्यतिरेकेणापि ब्रह्मणोऽवस्थानं श्रूयते – प्रकृतिविकारयोर्भेदेन व्यपदेशात् ‘ सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ३ । २) इति, ‘ तावानस्य महिमा ततो ज्यायाꣳश्च पूरुषः । पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिविऽ (छा। उ। ३ । १२ । ६) इति चैवंजातीयकात्

BSBh. 2.1.27

Just as the scriptures speak of the creation of the world from Brahman, they also speak of the existence of Brahman, as apart from its modifications, inasmuch as they speak of the cause (i.e. Prakṛti, Brahman) and its modification (Vikāra) as being different from each other.

By passages of the type of “This deity thought, I will now enter into these three divinities (i.e. into the Pṛthivī, Āpaḥ and Tejas) as the Jīva-Self and evolve names and forms” (Chan.Up. 6.3.2), and “So much is its greatness, and the Puruṣa is even greater than that. His one foot (i.e. quarter) represents all the beings, and the other three feet (quarters) represent that which is immortal in heaven” (Chan.Up. 3.12.6).

यतः उपासनाश्रितः उपासनामात्मनो मोक्षसाधनत्वेन गतः उपासकोऽहं ममोपास्यं ब्रह्म । तदुपासनं कृत्वा जाते ब्रह्मणीदानीं वर्तमानः अजं ब्रह्म शरीरपातादूर्ध्वं प्रतिपत्स्ये प्रागुत्पत्तेश्चाजमिदं सर्वमहं च । यदात्मकोऽहं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिदानीं जातो जाते ब्रह्मणि च वर्तमान उपासनया पुनस्तदेव प्रतिपत्स्ये इत्येवमुपासनाश्रितो धर्मः साधकः येनैवं क्षुद्रब्रह्मवित् , तेनासौ कारणेन कृपणो दीनोऽल्पकः स्मृतो नित्याजब्रह्मदर्शिभिर्महात्मभिरित्यभिप्रायः

Man.Up.Ka. 3.1 Bh.

The word “upāsanāśritaḥ” in the text, meaning the one betaking himself to devotion, signifies him who has recourse to devotional exercises as means to the attainment of liberation and who further thinks that he is the devotee and Brahman is his object of worship. This Jiva or the embodied being further thinks that through devotional practices he, at present related to the evolved Brahman (Personal Lord), would attain to the ultimate Brahman after the dissolution of the body. Prior to the

manifestation, according to this Jiva, everything including itself, was unborn. In other words, he thinks, “I shall, through devotional practices, regain that which was my real nature before manifestation, though at present I subsist in the Brahman that appears in the form of the manifold.” Such a Jiva, that is, the aspirant, betaking itself to devotion, inasmuch as it knows only a partial aspect of Brahman (kṣudrabrahmavit), is called of small or poor (intellect) by those who regard Brahman as eternal and unchanging.

Section 92

References:

कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत् । कारणं परं ब्रह्म ।
तस्मात्कारणात्परमार्थतोऽनन्यत्वं व्यतिरेकेणाभावः कार्यस्यावगम्यते ।
कुतः ? आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः

BSBh. 2.1.14

The effects comprise of this diverse world, such as the Ākāśa etc. and the cause is the Highest Self i.e. Brahman. It is understood that in a real sense the effect is non-different from the cause i.e. the Highest Self, i.e. it has no existence as apart from its cause, the Highest Self. Whence is it so? Because of the word ‘Ārambhaṇa’ and others.

आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्य इत्यादिशब्दात् । 'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यम् स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' (छन्।उप्।६।८।७), इदम् सर्वं यदयमात्मा' (ब्र्।उप्। २।४।६)
'ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (मुन्।उप्। २।२।११)
'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (छन्।उप्। ७।२५।२)
'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।४।१९)
इत्येवमाद्यप्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनपरं वचनजातमुदाहर्तव्यम्
BSBh. 2.1.14

By the word 'etc.' in the passage "because of the word 'Ārambhaṇa' etc.", The following several Scriptural passages – viz. "In that all, this has its Self, it is the Truth, this is the Self, that thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7);
"All this is that which is the Self" (Br.Up. 2.4.6);
"All this is Brahman" (Mun.Up. 2.2.11);
"The Self is all this" (Chan.Up. 7.25.2);
"There is no diversity here about anything" (Br.Up. 4.4.19) – which have the purpose of expounding the unity of the Selfs, should also be understood to have been cited (in illustration).

इतश्च कारणादनन्यत्वं कार्यस्य, यत्कारणं भाव एव कारणस्य कार्यमुपलभ्यते, नाभावे । तद्यथा - सत्यां मृदि घट उपलभ्यते, सत्सु च तन्तुषु पटः । न च नियमेनान्यभावेऽन्यस्योपलब्धिर्दृष्टा
BSBh. 2.1.15

Again why **the effect is non-different from its cause, is, because it is only when the cause exists, that the effect is seen to exist, and not when it does not.** For

instance, it is in the presence of clay only that a pot is seen to exist, and in the presence of yarns only that cloth is seen to exist. It is not, that when one thing exists, that, as a rule, another thing is to be seen to exist.

Section 93

References:

ननु मृदो घटो जायते पितुश्च पुत्रः ।

सत्यम् , अस्ति जायत इति प्रत्ययः शब्दश्च मूढानाम् । तावेव तु शब्दप्रत्ययौ विवेकिभिः परीक्ष्येते – किं सत्यमेव तौ, उत मृषा इति ; यावता परीक्ष्यमाणे शब्दप्रत्ययविषयं वस्तु घटपुत्रादिलक्षणं शब्दमात्रमेव तत् , 'वाचारम्भणम्' (छा। उ। ६ । ४ । ४) इति श्रुतेः । सच्चेत् न जायते, सत्त्वात् , मृत्पित्रादिवत् ।

यद्यसत् , तथापि न जायते, असत्त्वादेव, शशविषाणादिवत् । अथ सदसत् , तथापि न जायते विरुद्धस्यैकस्यासम्भवात् । अतो न किञ्चिद्वस्तु जायत इति सिद्धम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.22 Bh.

Objection: A jar is produced from clay, and a son is born of a father.

Reply: Yes, the deluded use a word like "birth" and have a notion corresponding to the word. Both the word and the notion are examined by men of discrimination who

wish to ascertain whether these are true or not. After examination they come to the conclusion that things, such as a jar or a son, etc., denoted by the words and signified by the notions, are mere verbal expressions. The scripture also corroborates it, saying, “All effects are mere names and figures of speech.” If a thing exists, it is not born like clay, father etc. since it is existent. If it does not exist, then too it is not born, it being itself non-existent, like the horn of a hare (sasavisāṇa). It a thing is existent, as well as non-existent, then too it is not born, since a thing such as this, which involves a contradiction, is an impossibility. Hence it becomes proved that nothing whatsoever is born.

परमार्थतस्तु न कस्यचित्केनचिदपि प्रकारेण कार्यकारणभाव उपपद्यते । कथम् ? नास्ति असद्धेतुकम् असत् शशविषाणादि हेतुः कारणं यस्य असत एव खपुष्पादेः, तत् असद्धेतुकम् असत् न विद्यते । तथा सदपि घटादिवस्तु असद्धेतुकम् शशविषाणादिकार्यं नास्ति । तथा सच्च विद्यमानं घटादि वस्त्वन्तरकार्यं नास्ति । सत्कार्यम् असत् कुत एव सम्भवति ? न चान्यः कार्यकारणभावः सम्भवति शक्यो वा कल्पयितुम् । अतो विवेकिनामसिद्ध एव कार्यकारणभावः कस्यचिदित्यभिप्रायः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.40 Bh.

In (the Absolute) reality nothing can be said to have any causal relationship in any way whatsoever. How? There is no unreal thing that is the cause of another unreal thing. That is to say, an unreal thing such as the horn of a hare, does not exist as the cause of a non-existing thing like the sky-flower etc. Similarly, an existing thing such as a jar too, cannot be the product of an unreal thing, such as a hare's horn. Also, an existing thing such as a jar cannot be the product of another existing thing, a jar for instance. **How can the unreal be the product of the real? Neither does there exist any other relationship of causality nor is it possible to imagine so. Hence the sense implied is that to those discriminating men causal relationship of anything whatsoever is ever unestablished.**

Section 94

References:

प्रधानकारणवादो वेदविद्भिरपि कैश्चिन्मन्वादिभिः
सत्कार्यत्वाद्यंशोपजीवनाभिप्रायेणोपनिबद्धः

BSBh. 2.2.17

The theory about the Pradhāna being the cause (of the world) has been accepted to a small extent at least, by

Manu and others learned in the Vedas on the ground of its being helpful by reason of its supporting the Sat-kārya-Vāda (viz. the theory that an effect always pre-exists as a cause, before it is created etc.).

साङ्ख्यस्यापि यः परिणामपक्षः सोऽपि
अपूर्वधर्मोत्पत्तिविनाशाङ्गीकरणात् वैशेषिकपक्षात् न विशिष्यते ।
अभिव्यक्तितिरोभावाङ्गीकरणेऽपि अभिव्यक्तितिरोभावयोः
विद्यमानत्वाविद्यमानत्वनिरूपणे पूर्ववदेव प्रमाणविरोधः । एतेन
कारणस्यैव संस्थानम् उत्पत्त्यादि इत्येतदपि प्रत्युक्तम्

BGh. 18.48

As the Parinama (transformation) theory of the Sankhyas, even that theory does not differ from the theory of the Vaiseshikas, inasmuch as it postulates the production of properties nonexistent before, as well as their destruction. Even admitting their explanation that by manifestation or disappearance (an effect is said to come into existence or undergo destruction), the theory is all the same opposed to evidence, as may be found if we enquire whether the manifestation and disappearance are previously existent or nonexistent. For the same reason, we have to condemn that theory also which says that production, etc., of an effect, are only different states of the cause itself.

पारिशेष्यात् सत् एकमेव वस्तु अविद्यया उत्पत्तिविनाशादिधर्मैः अनेकधा नटवत् विकल्प्यते इति

BGh. 18.48

As the only other alternative, there remains this theory, that the One Existence, the sole Reality, is by avidya, imagined variously, as so many things undergoing production, destruction and the like changes, like an actor on the stage.

तथा मूलकारणमेव आ अन्त्यात्कार्यात् तेन तेन कार्याकारेण नटवत्सर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते

BSBh. 2.1.18

Similarly, it is only the fundamental cause, which, like an actor, assumes different forms as effects right down to the last effect, and becomes amenable to all worldly transactions.

Section 95

References:

भूतं न जायते किञ्चिदभूतं नैव जायते ।

विवदन्तोऽद्वया ह्येवमजातिं ख्यापयन्ति ते

Ma.Up.Ka 4.4 (sruti)

The existent cannot (again) pass into (birth) existence. Nor can the nonexistent be born or come into being as existent. Thus, disputing among themselves, they, as a matter of fact, tend to establish the Advaita view and support the Ajāti or the absolute nonevolution (of what exists).

भूतं विद्यमानं वस्तु न जायते किञ्चिद्विद्यमानत्वादेव आत्मवत् इत्येवं वदन् असद्वादी साङ्ख्यपक्षं प्रतिषेधति सज्जन्म । तथा अभूतम् अविद्यमानम् अविद्यमानत्वान्नैव जायते शशविषाणवत् इत्येवं वदन्साङ्ख्योऽपि असद्वादिपक्षमसज्जन्म प्रतिषेधति।

विवदन्तः विरुद्धं वदन्तः अद्वयाः अद्वैतिनो ह्येते अन्योन्यस्य पक्षौ सदसतोर्जन्मनी प्रतिषेधन्तः अजातिम् अनुत्पत्तिमर्थात्ख्यापयन्ति प्रकाशयन्ति ते

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.4. Bh

A thing that exists already is not born, since it has existence, as is the case with the Self. Thus arguing, the follower of the theory that the effect does not exist prior to its birth, refutes the theory of the Sankhyas who hold that a cause that is existent is born (as effect). So, too, the follower of the Sankhya theory, by saying that cause that is non-existent, cannot be productive of any effect for the very reason that it, like hare's horn, is non-existing, refutes the birth of a thing that is non-existent, as is

argued by the follower of the view that the effect before birth is non-existent. Thus, talking contrarily, these *non-dualists (actually dualists without understanding here) who refute each other's view with regard to the birth of the existent or non-existent, reveal, in effect, the birthlessness.

Section 96

References:

कारणं यस्य वै कार्यं कारणं तस्य जायते ।

जायमानं कथमजं भिन्नं नित्यं कथं च तत्

Ma.Up.K.a 4.11 (sruti)

The disputant, according to whom the cause itself is the effect, maintains that the cause itself is born as the effect. How is it possible for the cause to be unborn if it be said to be born (as the effect)? How, again, is it said to be eternal if it be subject to modification (i.e., birth)?

कारणाद्यद्यनन्यत्वमतः कार्यमजं तव ।

जायमानाद्धि वै कार्यात्कारणं ते कथं ध्रुवम्

Ma.Up.K.a 4.12 (sruti)

If, as you say, the cause is nondifferent from the effect, then the effect also must be unborn. Further, how can the cause be permanent if it be nondifferent from the effect which is born?

अजाद्वै जायते यस्य दृष्टान्तस्तस्य नास्ति वै ।

जाताच्च जायमानस्य न व्यवस्था प्रसज्यते

Ma.Up.K.a 4.13 (sruti)

There is no illustration to support the view of him who says that the effect is born from the unborn cause. Again, if it be said that the effect is produced from a cause which is itself born then it leads to a regressus ad infinitum.

Section 97

References:

यदि तावत् द्व्यणुकादि द्रव्यं प्राक् उत्पत्तेः अत्यन्तमेव असत् , उत्पन्नं च स्थितं कञ्चित् कालं पुनः अत्यन्तमेव असत्त्वम् आपद्यते, तथा च सति असदेव सत् जायते, सदेव असत्त्वम् आपद्यते, अभावः भावो भवति, भावश्च अभावो भवति ; तत्र अभावः जायमानः प्राक् उत्पत्तेः शशविषाणकल्पः समवाय्यसमवायिनिमित्ताख्यं कारणम् अपेक्ष्य जायते इति । न च एवम् अभावः उत्पद्यते, कारणं च अपेक्षते इति शक्यं

वक्तुम् , असतां शशविषाणादीनाम् अदर्शनात् । भावात्मकाश्चेत् घटादयः उत्पद्यमानाः, किञ्चित् अभिव्यक्तिमात्रे कारणम् अपेक्ष्य उत्पद्यन्ते इति शक्यं प्रतिपत्तुम् । किञ्च, असतश्च सतश्च सद्भावे असद्भावे न क्वचित् प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारेषु विश्वासः कस्यचित् स्यात् , 'सत् सदेव असत् असदेवऽ इति निश्चयानुपपत्तेः

BGh. 18.48

If a dvyanuka (an aggregate of two atoms) or other substance is absolutely nonexistent before its production, and if, remaining for a time after production, it again becomes nonexistent, then it follows that what was nonexistent becomes existent, and what is existent will become nonexistent; that nonentity becomes an entity, and an entity becomes nonentity. In that case it must be that a nonentity (abhava) which is to become an entity (bhava) is like a rabbit's horn before becoming an entity, and that it becomes an entity by the action of the threefold cause of the material, the nonmaterial or accidental, and the efficient causes (samavayi asamavayinimittakaranas). Now, it is not possible to hold (in the present case) that a nonentity is born and needs a cause; for, it does not apply to other nonentities, such as a rabbit's horn. If a pot or the like, which is to be produced (as an effect), be of the nature of an entity, then we can understand that when it is to be produced

as an effect, it needs a cause so far merely as regards its manifestation. Moreover, if the nonexistent should become existent and the existent should become nonexistent, then nobody can be certain as to anything whatsoever in matters of evidence and things ascertainable by evidence, inasmuch as there can be no certainty that the existent will continue to be existent, and the nonexistent will continue to be nonexistent.

तद्धैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीत्ऽ इति चासत्पक्षमुपक्षिप्य, ‘ कथमसतः सज्जायेतऽ इत्याक्षिप्य, ‘ सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्ऽ इत्यवधारयति ; तत्रेदंशब्दवाच्यस्य कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेः सच्छब्दवाच्येन कारणेन सामानाधिकरण्यस्य श्रूयमाणत्वात् , सत्त्वानन्यत्वे प्रसिध्यतः । यदि तु प्रागुत्पत्तेरसत्कार्यं स्यात् , पश्चाच्चोत्पद्यमानं कारणे समवेयात् , तदान्यत्कारणात्स्यात् , तत्र ‘ येनाश्रुत श्रुतं भवतिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ३) इतीयं प्रतिज्ञा पीड्येत ; सत्त्वानन्यत्वावगतेस्त्वियं प्रतिज्ञा समर्थ्यते

BGh. 2.1.18

After challenging the view of the non-existence of the effect (before creation) thus – “Some said, this was not in existence in the beginning”, and then by saying thus – “How can existence spring from non-existence?”. It is finally concluded by the scriptures, thus – “Sat alone was existing in the beginning” (ChanU.6.2.1). Now in as much

as it is understood from the scriptures that the effect which is indicated by the word 'Idam' has the same case-ending as the cause indicated by the word 'Sat' (existing) i.e. there is oneness between them, the existence of (the effect) prior to its creation And its non-difference with the cause, becomes established. If on the other hand, an effect prior to its creation were to be non-existent and were it to establish a relation with the material cause after its creation then it would be an entity different from the cause, and in that case the original declaration, viz., "By which that which is unheard becomes heard" (Chan.Up. 6.1.3), would be contradicted. And it is only by understanding that the effect exists prior to its creation and that it is non-different from the cause, that the original declaration can be upheld.

कूटस्थाच्चेत्कारणात्कार्यमुत्पद्येत, अविशेषात्सर्वं सर्वत उत्पद्येत ; तस्मादभावग्रस्तेभ्यो
बीजादिभ्योऽङ्कुरादीनामुत्पद्यमानत्वादभावाद्भावोत्पत्तिः – इति मन्यन्ते । तत्रेदमुच्यते – ' नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात्ऽ इति । नाभावाद्भाव उत्पद्यते ; यद्यभावाद्भाव उत्पद्येत,
अभावत्वाविशेषात्कारणविशेषाभ्युपगमोऽनर्थकः स्यात् ; न हि, बीजादीनामुपमृदितानां योऽभावस्तस्याभावस्य शशविषाणादीनां च, निःस्वभावत्वाविशेषादभावत्वे कश्चिद्विशेषोऽस्ति ; येन, बीजादेवाङ्कुरो

जायते क्षीरादेव दधि – इत्येवंजातीयकः
कारणविशेषाभ्युपगमोऽर्थवान्स्यात् ; निर्विशेषस्य त्वभावस्य
कारणत्वाभ्युपगमे शशविषाणादिभ्योऽप्यङ्कुरादयो जायेरन् ; न चैवं
दृश्यते ; यदि पुनरभावस्यापि विशेषोऽभ्युपगम्येत – उत्पलादीनामिव
नीलत्वादिः, ततो विशेषवत्त्वादेवाभावस्य भावत्वमुत्पलादिवत्प्रसज्येत ;
नाप्यभावः कस्यचिदुत्पत्तिहेतुः स्यात् , अभावत्वादेव, शशविषाणादिवत्
; अभावाच्च भावोत्पत्तावभावान्वितमेव सर्वं कार्यं स्यात् ; न चैवं
दृश्यते, सर्वस्य च वस्तुनः स्वेन स्वेन रूपेण
भावात्मनैवोपलभ्यमानत्वात् ; न च मृदन्विताः शरावादयो
भावास्तन्त्वादिविकाराः केनचिदभ्युपगम्यन्ते ; मृद्विकारानेव तु
मृदन्वितान्भावान् लोकः प्रत्येति । यत्तूक्तम् – स्वरूपोपमर्दमन्तरेण
कस्यचित्कूटस्थस्य वस्तुनः
कारणत्वानुपपत्तेरभावाद्भावोत्पत्तिर्भवितुमर्हतीति, तदद्युरुक्तम् ,
स्थिरस्वभावानामेव सुवर्णादीनां प्रत्यभिज्ञायमानानां
रुचकादिकारणभावदर्शनात् ; येष्वपि बीजादिषु स्वरूपोपमर्दो लक्ष्यते,
तेष्वपि नासावुपमृद्यमाना पूर्वावस्था उत्तरावस्थायाः
कारणमभ्युपगम्यते, अनुपमृद्यमानानामेवानुयायिनां
बीजाद्यवयवानामङ्कुरादिकारणभावाभ्युपगमात् । तस्मादसद्भ्यः
शशविषाणादिभ्यः सदुत्पत्त्यदर्शनात् , सद्भ्यश्च सुवर्णादिभ्यः
सदुत्पत्तिदर्शनात् , अनुपपन्नोऽयमभावाद्भावोत्पत्त्यभ्युपगमः

BSBh. 2.2.26

(They say) if effects were to result from one unchangeable cause (such as Brahman). Then such unchangeable cause being everywhere common,

everything would come into existence, on every side simultaneously. Therefore they consider, that as sprouts result from seeds which have been swallowed up into non-existence, entities result from non-existence.

Reply: By the Sūtra "Existence (i.e. an entity) does not (result) from non-existence because it is not so observed" – i.e. an entity does not result from nonexistence. Were an entity to result from non-existence, such non-existence being common everywhere, any assumption of a special cause (for an effect) would be meaningless. Non-existence as caused by the destruction of seeds, and the non-existence of the horns of a hare, being typically the same, because the nature of non-existence is common, there could not be any such special distinction in such nonexistence, as a result of which, a sprout should result only from a seed, and curds should result only from milk. By reason of which the assumption of any such type of special cause could have any meaning. And if non-existence, without having any special type, were to be assumed to be the cause (of effects, as the Vainā́ika holds), then sprouts etc. may just as well result from the horns of a hare (which are totally non-existent) etc., but it is never observed to be so. If, however, one were to assume (the existence of) a special attribute of non-

existence – Like, for instance, the blueness of a lotus – As a special quality, then precisely because of the assumption of the existence of a special quality pertaining to non-existence. Such non-existence would itself become an existing entity, quite as much as a lotus (which has blueness as its quality) is an existing entity. Nor can non-existence possibly ever be the cause of any creation, precisely because of its being such 'nonexistence', like, for instance, the total non-existence (Tucchatva) of the horns of a hare. Were entities to result from non-existence, all the resulting entities also would necessarily be characterized by non-existence. But it is not observed to be so, because all entities are perceived to possess their own individual specific qualities as existing entities. Nobody ever understands that water-troughs which are earthen, are entities which are the modifications of threads etc. while everybody cognizes the modifications of earth to be earthen. With respect to the argument advanced (by the Vainā́ika), viz. that because it is not reasonably sustainable to understand an unchangeable entity to be the cause (of any effect) unless its own nature is destroyed, non-existence has to be understood to be the cause (of effects), (it must be said that) it is a wrong statement, because it is observed that gold etc.

whose nature (as gold etc.) is constant and is recognized to be so, are the cause of results such as ornaments etc. Even in the case of seeds etc. whose nature is seen to be destroyed, it is not the antecedent destruction (of the seeds) that is understood to be the cause of their subsequent condition (as sprouts), because, it is understood that it is the particles (cells) of the seeds which constitute the seeds themselves, and which persist in the effect, and which do not get destroyed, that are the cause of the sprouts.

Therefore, as actual existence of an entity is never seen to result from the totally nonexisting horns of a hare. And as on the other hand the actual coming into existence (of ornaments) is observed to result from gold etc., the doctrine that entities result from nonexistence is not reasonably sustainable.

शून्यवादिपक्षस्तु सर्वप्रमाणविप्रतिषिद्ध इति तन्निराकरणाय नादरः क्रियते ।

न ह्ययं सर्वप्रमाणसिद्धो लोकव्यवहारोऽन्यत्तत्त्वमनधिगम्य शक्यतेऽपह्नोतुम् । अपवादाभावे उत्सर्गप्रसिद्धेः

BSBh. 2.2.31

We do not propose even to extend the courtesy of taking any notice of the doctrine of Nihilism (Śunya-Vāda) by

way of refuting it, as it is entirely opposed to all means-of-proof, and as this course of worldly transactions which is established by all the means-of-proof cannot be rejected in the absence of any definite knowledge of any better principle, and as it is well-known that in the absence of any exception (to be found to be against a rule) the rule is taken as firmly established.

नासतो विद्यते भावो नाभावो विद्यते सतः ।

उभयोरपि दृष्टोऽन्तस्त्वनयोस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः

BG. 2.16 (smriti)

Of the unreal no being there is; there is no nonbeing of the real. Of both these is the truth seen by the seers of the Essence.

इदं भागवतं मतम् उक्तम् 'नासतो विद्यते भावः (भ। गी। २ । १६) इत्यस्मिन् श्लोके, सत्प्रत्ययस्य अव्यभिचारात् , व्यभिचाराच्च इतरेषामिति

BGh. 18.48

This view of the Bhagavān has been stated in the verse, 'Of the unreal there is no being...' (BG. 2.16). For, the

idea of existence is constant, while the others are inconstant.

तत् तत्र ह एतस्मिन्प्रागुत्पत्तेर्वस्तुनिरूपणे एके वैनाशिका आहुः वस्तु निरूपयन्तः असत् सदभावमात्रं प्रागुत्पत्तेः इदं जगत् एकमेव अग्रे अद्वितीयमासीदिति । सदभावमात्रं हि प्रागुत्पत्तेस्तत्त्वं कल्पयन्ति बौद्धाः । न तु सत्प्रतिद्वन्द्वि वस्त्वन्तरमिच्छन्ति । यथा सच्चासदिति गृह्यमाणं यथाभूतं तद्विपरीतं तत्त्वं भवतीति नैयायिकाः

Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.

In this regard, i.e. while determining the (nature of the) thing prior to creation, certain Vainasikas (Buddhists) consider that this universe was, prior to creation, one, non-dual, Non-existent in the beginning, that is to say, the Buddhists subscribe to the theory that this was nothing but Sad-abhava, prior to creation: They do not admit anything other than Sat as its counterpart, unlike the Naiyayikas who hold that there are two things - Sat and Asat - i.e. that of which cognition is possible as it really is, and that which is its opposite.

असत्त्वमात्राभ्युपगमोऽप्ययुक्त एव, अभ्युपगन्तुरनभ्युपगमानुपपत्तेः । इदानीमभ्युपगन्ता अभ्युपगम्यते न प्रागुत्पत्तेरिति चेत् , न, प्रागुत्पत्तेः सदभावस्य प्रमाणाभावात् । प्रागुत्पत्ते रसदेवेति कल्पनानुपपत्तिः

Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.

And their admission of mere nonexistence is also illogical because **the existence of the person who denies existence, cannot be denied.** If it is held that the admitter (of nonexistence) exists now but not before creation, then, it is not so because there is no proof of nonexistence of Existence before creation. It is illogical to imagine that there was nonexistence alone before creation.

Section 98

References:

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते

Ma.Up.Ka 3.27 (sruti)

That which is everexistent appears to pass into birth through illusion (Māyā) and not from the standpoint of Reality. He who thinks that this passing into birth is real asserts, as a matter of fact, that what is born is born again (and so on without end).

अथवा, सतः विद्यमानस्य वस्तुनो रज्ज्वादेः सर्पादिवत् मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतो यथा, तथा अग्राह्यस्यापि सत एवात्मनो रज्जुसर्पवज्जगद्रूपेण मायया जन्म युज्यते । न तु तत्त्वत

एवाजस्यात्मनो जन्म । यस्य पुनः परमार्थसदजमात्मतत्त्वं जगद्रूपेण जायते वादिनः, न हि तस्य अजं जायत इति शक्यं वक्तुम् , विरोधात् । ततः तस्यार्थाज्जातं जायत इत्यापन्नम् ।
ततश्चानवस्थापाताज्जायमानत्वं न । तस्मादजमेकमेवात्मतत्त्वमिति सिद्धम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.27 Bh.

Just as a snake etc. can be born from an existing thing like a rope etc, possibly through Maya, but not in reality, so too, the Self that is existent, though incomprehensible, can have birth in the form of the universe through Maya like a snake illusorily seen on a rope. But in Reality the Self that is unborn cannot have any birth. As regards the disputant who argues that ths unborn Self, absolute real, takes birth in the form of the universe, he cannot assert that the birthless is born as it implies a contradiction. Consequently, he should admit that what is born already is (re)born. These circumstances under which birth occurs from what is (already) born, will lead to ad infinitum. **Therefore, it becomes proved that the Self, the Reality, is but unborn and one.**

यथैव हीदानीमपीदं कार्यं कारणात्मना सत्, एवं प्रागुत्पत्तेरपीति गम्यते । न हीदानीमपीदं कार्यं कारणात्मानमन्तरेण स्वतन्त्रमेवास्ति - 'सर्वं तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनः सर्वं वेद' (ब्र्।उप् २।४।६) इत्यादिश्रवणात् । कारणात्मना तु सत्त्वं कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेरविशिष्टम् । ननु शब्दादिहीनं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणम् । बाढम् - न तु शब्दादिमत्कार्यं कारणात्मना हीनं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिदानीं वा अस्ति । तेन न शक्यते वक्तुं प्रागुत्पत्तेरसत्कार्यमिति

BSBh. 2.1.7

It is understood, that just as even at the present moment the effect having its self as its cause does exist, even so does the effect exist before its creation (in the form of the Self, which is its cause). Even at the present moment, the effect does not have existence, independently of the Self of its cause, because the scriptures say thus: – "Everything ousts (i.e. abandons or outlaws) him who looks upon everything as (existing) apart from its Self" (Br.Up. 2.4.6).

The existence of the effect before its creation, however, as the Self of its cause, is not different (from the existence of the effect, as an effect having that cause as its Self).

Objection: Brahman which is soundless etc., is the cause of the world (isn't it what you hold?).

Reply: Certainly, but an effect which is equipped with the quality of sound etc. is never without its cause 'the Self' inhering in it, before its creation, nor is it so now (after the effect is created). Hence, it cannot be maintained that an effect is non-existent before its creation.

असतो मायया जन्म तत्त्वतो नैव युज्यते ।

वन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वापि जायते

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.28 (sruti)

The unreal cannot be born either really or through Māyā. For the son of a barren woman is born neither in reality nor in illusion.

असद्वादिनाम् असतो भावस्य मायया तत्त्वतो वा न कथञ्चन जन्म युज्यते, अदृष्टत्वात् । न हि वन्ध्यापुत्रो मायया तत्त्वतो वा जायते । तस्मादत्रासद्वादो दूरत एवानुपपन्न इत्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.28 Bh.

Birth of a thing that is non-existent is not possible in any manner for those who hold that everything is unreal, for we see no such thing (in experience). Never is born a barren woman's son either through Maya or in reality. Therefore, the theory of the non-existence (of things) is in truth untenable.

योऽसावुपनिषत्स्वेवाधिगतः पुरुषोऽसंसारी ब्रह्मस्वरूपः उत्पाद्यादि-चतुर्विधद्रव्यविलक्षणः स्वप्रकरणस्थोऽनन्यशेषः, नासौ नास्ति नाधिगम्यत इति वा शक्यं वदितुम् । 'स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।९।२६) इत्यात्मशब्दात् । आत्मनश्च प्रत्याख्यातुमशक्यत्वात्, य एव निराकर्ता तस्यैवात्मत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

It cannot be said about that Puruṣa which can be comprehended only from the Upaniṣads, and which is not of a transmigratory nature, and which in fact is Brahman, and is different from the fourfold materials of things which are liable to be created etc., and which is a topic in itself, and is not subsidiary to any thing else, that it is not, or that it cannot be comprehended, because, in the following scriptural passage it is described as the Ātmā (the Self) thus – (The Self can only be described negatively as) "Ātmā is, not that, not that" (Br.Up. 3.9.26) and it is not possible to deny the Self, because whosoever endeavours to deny it, is himself the Self (Ātmā).

Section 99

References:

न च शब्दार्थव्यवहारमात्रेण कस्यचिदर्थस्य प्रसिद्धिर्भवति ।

प्रमाणान्तरसिद्धयोः शब्दार्थयोर्व्यवहारावतारात्

BSBh 2.2.15

It is not that the existence of an entity (Artha) is established, merely because a word signifying that entity is actually in common use, because it is only when its existence is proved by other means-of-proof that words and their meaning are received into common use

घटादेरेव प्रागभावस्य स्वकारणसम्बन्धो भवति न वन्ध्यापुत्रादेः, अभावस्य तुल्यत्वेऽपि इति विशेषः अभावस्य वक्तव्यः । एकस्य अभावः, द्वयोः अभावः, सर्वस्य अभावः, प्रागभावः, प्रध्वंसाभावः, इतरेतराभावः, अत्यन्ताभावः इति लक्षणतो न केनचित् विशेषो दर्शयितुं शक्यः ।

असति च विशेषे घटस्य प्रागभावः एव कुलालादिभिः घटभावम् आपद्यते सम्बध्यते च भावेन कपालाख्येन ।

सम्बद्धश्च सर्वव्यवहारयोग्यश्च भवति, न तु घटस्यैव प्रध्वंसाभावः अभावत्वे सत्यपि, इति प्रध्वंसाद्यभावानां न क्वचित् व्यवहारयोग्यत्वम्

, प्रागभावस्यैव द्व्यणुकादिद्रव्याख्यस्य उत्पत्त्यादिव्यवहारार्हत्वम् इत्येतत् असमञ्जसम् ; अभावत्वाविशेषात् अत्यन्तप्रध्वंसाभावयोरिव

BGh. 18.48

If we are to hold that the antecedent Nonexistence (pragabhava) of a pot or the like becomes related to the cause, but not the barren woman's son, notwithstanding that both are alike nonentities (abhava), it is necessary to show how one nonentity can be distinguished from the other. Nonexistence of one, Nonexistence of two, Nonexistence of all, antecedent nonexistence (pragabhava), Nonexistence after destruction (pradhvasambhava), mutual Nonexistence (anyonyabhava) absolute Nonexistence (atyantabhava), nobody can point out any definite distinction among these in themselves. In the absence of a distinction, it is unreasonable to hold that only the antecedent Nonexistence of a pot becomes a pot through the action of a potter, etc., that it becomes related to a cause of its own, viz., the pot shreds which are existent, that when thus related it can very well be spoken of as being produced and so on, but that such is not the case with regard to the Nonexistence after destruction (pradhvasambhava) of the same pot, though both alike are nonexistent. It is unreasonable to hold that other nonexistences (abhavas), such as Nonexistence

after destruction, can never become (an existent effect) and so on, whereas antecedent Nonexistence alone, such as that of dvyanuka and the like substances, can become (an existent effect) and so on, though it is an abhava or non - existent quite as much as Nonexistence after destruction or absolute Nonexistence.

यदि पुनरभावस्यापि विशेषोऽभ्युपगम्येत - उत्पलादीनामिव नीलत्वादिः । ततो विशेषवत्त्वादेवाभावस्य । भावत्वमुत्पलादिवत्प्रसज्येत

BSBh. 2.2.26

If, however, one assumes (the existence of) a special attribute of non-existence – Like, for instance, the blueness of a lotus – as a special quality, then precisely because of the assumption of the existence of a special quality pertaining to non-existence. Such non-existence would itself become an existing entity, quite as much as a lotus (which has blueness as its quality) is an existing entity.

Section 100

References:

भावप्रतियोगी ह्यभावः । यथा ह्यभिन्नोऽपि भावो घटपटादिभिर्विशेष्यते भिन्न इव घटभावः पटभाव इति, एवं निर्विशेषोऽप्यभावः क्रियागुणयोगाद्द्रव्यादिवद्विकल्प्यते । न ह्यभाव उत्पलादिवद्विशेषणसहभावी । विशेषणवत्त्वे भाव एव स्यात्

Tai.Up.Upod Bh.

Non-existence is in fact that which is opposed to existence. On the analogy that existence, though one, is differentiated by a pot or a cloth, as the existence of a pot or the existence of a cloth, as though they are different, the non existence of existence, too, though undifferentiated, is imagined to be differentiated-just as substances etc. are-owing to the (fancied) association (with them) of action, quality, etc. Not that a non-existence can coexist with a quality in the sense that a lotus does (with its colour etc.). Should it be possessed of an adjective, it will become nothing but existence.

यथा घटादिसंस्थानं चक्षुषा निरूप्यमाणं मृद्व्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत् , तथा सर्वो विकारः कारणव्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसन् । जन्मप्रध्वंसाभ्यां प्रागूर्ध्वं च अनुपलब्धेः कार्यस्य घटादेः मृदादिकारणस्य च तत्कारणव्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत्त्वम् ।

तदसत्त्वे सर्वाभावप्रसङ्ग इति चेत् । न ; सर्वत्र बुद्धिद्वयोपलब्धेः, सद्बुद्धिरसद्बुद्धिरिति । यद्विषया बुद्धिर्न व्यभिचरति, तत् सत् ;

यद्विषया व्यभिचरति, तदसत् ; इति सदसद्विभागे बुद्धितन्त्रे स्थिते । सर्वत्र द्वे बुद्धी सर्वैरुपलभ्येते समानाधिकरणे न नीलोत्पलवत् , सन् घटः, सन् पटः, सन् हस्ती इति । एवं सर्वत्र तयोर्बुद्ध्योः घटादिबुद्धिः व्यभिचरति । तथा च दर्शितम् । न तु सद्बुद्धिः । तस्मात् घटादिबुद्धिविषयः असन् , व्यभिचारात् ; न तु सद्बुद्धिविषयः, अव्यभिचारात्

BGh. 2.16

For instance, no objective form, such as an earthen pot, presented to consciousness by the eye, proves to be real, because it is not perceived apart from clay. Thus, every effect is unreal, because it is not perceived as distinct from its cause. Every effect, such as a pot, is unreal, also because it is not perceived before its production and after its destruction. And likewise, the cause, such as clay, is unreal because it is not perceived apart from its cause.

Objection: Then it comes to this: nothing at all exists.

Answer: No, (such an objection cannot arise here) because all experiences are constituted by a twofold consciousness (buddhi), the consciousness of the real (sadbuddhi) and the consciousness of the unreal (asadbuddhi). That alone is real (Sat) whose cognition is not mutable, and that is unreal whose cognition proves

mutable. Thus the distinction of reality and unreality depends on our consciousness. Now, in all our experience, twofold consciousness arises with reference to one and the same substratum (samanadhikarana), as, 'a cloth existent,' 'a pot existent,' 'an elephant existent' not as in the expression 'a blue lotus' and so on everywhere. Of the two, the consciousness of pot, etc., is temporary as was already pointed out, but not the consciousness of existence. Thus, the object corresponding to our consciousness of pot, etc., is unreal, because the consciousness is temporary; but what corresponds to our consciousness of existence is not unreal, because the consciousness is unfailing.

Section 101

References:

सत्यमिति यद्रूपेण यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं न व्यभिचरति, तत्सत्यम् । यद्रूपेण यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं व्यभिचरति, तदनृतमित्युच्यते । अतो विकारोऽनृतम् , ' वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ४) एवं सदेव सत्यमित्यवधारणात्

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

As for satya a thing is said to be satya, true, when it does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own; and a thing is said to be unreal when it changes the nature that is ascertained to be its own. **Hence a mutable thing is unreal, for in the text, 'All transformation has speech as its basis, and it is name only.** Earth as such is the reality' (Ch.Up. 6.1.4), it has been emphasised that, that alone is true that exists.

एकमेव हि परमार्थसत्यं ब्रह्म । इह पुनः व्यवहारविषयमापेक्षिकं सत्यम् , मृगतृष्णिकाद्यनृतापेक्षया उदकादि सत्यमुच्यते । अनृतं च तद्विपरीतम् । किं पुनः ? एतत्सर्वमभवत् , सत्यं परमार्थसत्यम् । किं पुनस्तत् ? ब्रह्म, 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' इति प्रकृतत्वात्

Tai.Up. 2.6.1 Bh.

For the absolute truth is only one, which is Brahman. But here the relative truth, as found in the empirical world, is referred to as for instance, water is said to be true in comparison with the water in a mirage which is false. Anrtam, untruth, is the opposite of that. Again, what is it that became, all this? That which is satyam, the absolute truth. What is that, again? It is Brahman; for it is Brahman that has been introuced as the topic of discussion by the sentence, 'Brahman is truth, knowledg, infinite.'

स्वप्नवृत्तावपि स्वप्नस्थानेऽपि अन्तश्चेतसा मनोरथसङ्कल्पितमसत् ; सङ्कल्पानन्तरसमकालमेवादर्शनात् । तत्रैव स्वप्ने बहिश्चेतसा गृहीतं चक्षुरादिद्वारेणोपलब्धं घटादि सदित्येवमसत्यमिति निश्चितेऽपि सदसद्विभागो दृष्टः । उभयोरप्यन्तर्बहिश्चेतः कल्पितयोर्वैतथ्यमेव दृष्टम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.9 Bh.

Even in the state of dream that which is imagined within by the mind is unreal, for it ceases to be seen at the next moment after being imagined. But there in the dream itself, what is grasped by the mind outside, for instance a jar, through the eye etc., is real, Thus, even what is settled as unreal (viz dream-experience) is seen to be both real and unreal. Both kinds of objects imagined by the mind internally and externally (in dream) are seen to be unreal.

सत एव द्वैतभेदेन अन्यथागृह्यमाणत्वात् न असत्त्वं कस्यचित्क्वचिदिति ब्रूमः । यथा सतोऽन्यद्वस्त्वन्तरं परिकल्प्य पुनस्तस्यैव प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रध्वंसाच्चोर्ध्वम् असत्त्वं ब्रुवते तार्किकाः, न तथा अस्माभिः कदाचित्क्वचिदपि सतोऽन्यदभिधानमभिधेयं वा वस्तु परिकल्प्यते ।

सदेव तु सर्वमभिधानमभिधीयते च यदन्यबुद्ध्या, यथा रज्जुरेव सर्पबुद्ध्या सर्प इत्यभिधीयते, यथा वा पिण्डघटादि मृदोऽन्यबुद्ध्या

पिण्डघटादिशब्देनाभिधीयते लोके । रज्जुविवेकदर्शिनां तु सर्पाभिधानबुद्धी निवर्तेते, यथा च मृद्विवेकदर्शिनां घटादिशब्दबुद्धी, तद्वत् सद्विवेकदर्शिनामन्यविकारशब्दबुद्धी निवर्तेते – 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (तै। उ। २ । ९ । १) इति, 'अनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने' (तै। उ। २ । ७ । १) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

Chand.Up. 6.2.3 Bh.

Since it is Existence itself that is perceived otherwise through the duality of different forms, therefore, there is nonexistence of anything anywhere. That is what we say. As the Nyaya school after assuming that a thing is different from existence, says again that it has no existence before its birth and after its destruction it is not assumed by us in that way, at anytime or anywhere, that any word or any thing denoted by the word can be there differently from Existence. But all words and all things that are spoken of with the idea of their being different from Existence, are Existence only, just as in the world a rope itself is spoken of as a snake, under the idea that it is a snake; or as a lump and pot etc. are referred to with the words lump and pot etc. under the idea that they are different from earth. But just as the world and idea of a snake cease for one who has the discriminating knowledge about the rope, and as the world and ideas of pot etc. cease for one who has the discriminating knowledge about earth, similarly words and ideas with

regard to all other transformation cease for those people who have the discriminating knowledge about Existence. This is so on the authority of such Upanisadic texts as: 'Failing to reach which (Brahman, as conditioned by the mind), words along with the mind turn back' (Tai.Up. 2.9.1); 'Whenever as aspirant gets fearlessly established...in the inexpressible, and supportless Brahman...' (Tai.Up. 2.7.1).

विशेषाकारमात्रं तु सर्वेषां मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तमिति वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयमनृतम् , त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ।
तान्यप्याकारविशेषतोऽनृतं स्वतः सन्मात्ररूपतया सत्यम् ।
प्राक्सदात्मप्रतिबोधात्स्वविषयेऽपि सर्वं सत्यमेव स्वप्नदृश्या इवेति न कश्चिद्विरोधः

Chand.Up. 8.5.4 Bh.

Only the modification of all things becomes the cause of the false notion, for 'modification dependent on speech is only name and is unreal; the three forms alone are real'. (Cha.Up. 6.4.1). Even these (three forms) left alone are unreal, they being forms particularly, but are also real being the nature of Reality itself. As in the case of objects seen in dream prior to waking into Sat that is the Self, everything is real in its respective sphere. Hence there is no contradiction.

अभावाच्च भावोत्पत्तावभावान्वितमेव सर्वं कार्यं स्यात् । न चैवं दृश्यते, सर्वस्य च वस्तुनः स्वेन स्वेन रूपेण भावात्मनैवोपलभ्यमानत्वात् । न च मृदन्विताः शरावादयो भावास्तन्त्वादिविकाराः केनचिदभ्युपगम्यन्ते ।
मृद्विकारानेव तु मृदन्वितान्भावान् लोकः प्रत्येति

BSBh. 2.2.26

Were entities to result from non-existence, all the resulting entities also would necessarily be characterized by non-existence. But it is not observed to be so, because all entities are perceived to possess their own individual specific qualities as existing entities. Nobody ever understands that water-troughs which are earthen, are entities which are the modifications of threads etc. While everybody cognizes the modifications of earth to be earthen.

अतः कुतस्तु खलु सोम्य एवं स्यात् इति ह उवाच – कथं केन प्रकारेण असतः सज्जायेत इति ; असतः सदुत्पत्तौ न कश्चिदपि दृष्टान्तप्रकारोऽस्तीत्यभिप्रायः । एवमसद्वादिपक्षमुन्मथ्य उपसंहरति – सत्त्वेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदिति स्वपक्षसिद्धिम्

Chand.Up. 6.2.2 Bh.

Therefore, he said, 'O good looking one, how can this be really so? How, in what way can existence be born out of nonexistence?' The idea implied is that there is no example whatever, to illustrate the birth of existence from nonexistence. Thus, after having demolished the view of whose who hand by nonexistence, the text concludes:

'but; surely O good looking one in the beginning; all this was Existence', thereby establishing its own position.

ननु निरवयवं सत् , 'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनं' (श्वे। उ। ६ । १९) 'दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ; निरवयवस्य सतः कथं विकारसंस्थानमुपपद्यते ?
नैष दोषः, रज्ज्वाद्यवयवेभ्यः सर्पादिसंस्थानवत् बुद्धिपरिकल्पितेभ्यः सदवयवेभ्यः विकारसंस्थानोपपत्तेः । 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ४) एवं सदेव सत्यम् – इति श्रुतेः । एकमेवाद्वितीयं परमार्थतः इदम्बुद्धिकालेऽपि

Chand.Up. 6.2.2 Bh.

Objection: Is it not that Existence is partless according to the Upanisadic texts: 'Partless, actionless, tranquil, faultless, taintless' (Sv.Up. 6.19); 'The Purusa is resplendent since He is formless, coextensive with all that is external and internal, and birthless' (Mund.Up. 2.1.2), and others? How can it be logical that Existence which is partless can have changeful configuration?

Reply: There is no such fault because, as from the constituents of rope etc. there can appear shapes like snake etc. Similarly it is logical that from the consistence of sat, Existence, imagined by the intellect, there can appear a changeful configuration. This is supported by the Upanisadic text, 'All transformation has speech as its

basis, and it is name only. Earth as such is the reality' (Chand.Up. 6.1.4); 'Existence indeed is the reality'. Even when one has the idea of 'this', there is in reality the One without a second.

Section 102

References:

अविद्यात्मकनामरूपबीजव्याकरणापेक्षत्वात्सर्वज्ञत्वस्य । ‘ तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतःऽ (तै। उ। २ । १ । १) इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः

नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वरूपात्सर्वज्ञात्सर्वशक्तेरीश्वराज्जगज्जनिस्थितिप्रलयाः, चेतनात्प्रधानादन्यस्माद्वा – इत्येषोऽर्थः प्रतिज्ञातः – ‘ जन्माद्यस्य यतःऽ (ब्र। सू। १ । १ । २) इति ; सा प्रतिज्ञा तदवस्थैव, न तद्विरुद्धोऽर्थः पुनरिहोच्यते ।

कथं नोच्यते, अत्यन्तमात्मन एकत्वमद्वितीयत्वं च ब्रुवता ?

शृणु यथा नोच्यते – सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलप्येते । ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः, ‘ आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्मऽ (छा। उ। ८ । १४ । १) इति श्रुतेः, ‘ नामरूपे व्याकरवाणिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ३ । २) ‘ सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि

कृत्वाभिवदन्यदास्तेऽ (तै। आ। ३ । १२ । ७) ‘ एकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोतिऽ (श्वे। उ। ६ । १२) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यश्च

BSBh. 2.1.14

the omniscience (of Brahman as the Lord) depends upon the evolving of the seed of the nature of names and forms which are the result of ignorance, and on the scriptural passage "The Akasha was born of this very Self" (Tait. 2.1), and that the origin, preservation and resorption of the world proceed from the Lord who is of an eternally pure, wise, and free nature, and neither from the nonsentient Pradhana nor from any other things, is what is declared (by the Sutrakara) by the Sutra" From whom is the origin etc. of this world" (Bra. Sut. 1.1.2). That declaration still holds the ground as before, and nothing contrary to that is here suggested.

Opponent: How can you say that you do not say so (i.e. you do not contradict the declaration) when you talk of the Self's eternal oneness and nonduality?

Reply: Listen, how we do not say so. It is declared by both the scriptures and the Smritis, that **names and forms which are imagined through ignorance and which are as it were the Self of the Omniscient Lord, and about which it is impossible to say, either that they are**

one with Brahman or that they are different from it, and which are the seeds of this entire expanse of transmigratory existence, are the illusion causing power (māyāśaktiḥ) and the nature (Prakriti) of the Lord. That the omniscient Lord is different from them is indicated by the Scriptural passage "The Ākāśa is the revealer of the names and forms, and that in which they are contained, is Brahman" (ChanU.8.14.1), and also according to the scriptural passages – "May I evolve names and forms" (ChanU.6.3.2); "Having created all beings and given them names, the Lord keeps on voicing them" (Tait. Ār. 3.12.7), "He makes the one seed manifold" (SvetU.6.12).

अविद्यात्मिका हि सा बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुषुप्तिः, यस्यां स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः । तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम् – 'एतस्मिन्नु खल्वक्षरे गार्ग्याकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्चऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ११) इति श्रुतेः ; क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम् – 'अक्षरात्परतः परःऽ (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) इति श्रुतेः ; क्वचिन्मायेति सूचितम् – 'मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्ऽ (श्वे। उ। ४ । १०) इति मन्त्रवर्णात् ; अव्यक्ता हि सा माया, तत्त्वान्यत्वनिरूपणस्याशक्यत्वात्

BSBh. 1.4.3

This potential power (bījaśakti) **of the seed is of the nature of ignorance, and it is indicated by the word 'undeveloped' (avyakta),** and has the Highest Lord as its basis, and is of the nature of an illusion (Māyā), and is the great sleep, in which the transmigratory Jīva-Selfs unaware of their own true nature (Rūpa) continue to slumber on. This same 'undeveloped' (Avyakta) is occasionally indicated by the word Ākāśa, as in the scriptural passage – "Verily, Oh Gārgi, in this, the imperishable one, is the Ākāśa woven weft-and-warp-wise" (Br.Up. 3.8.11). **Occasionally it is expressed by the word 'Akṣara'**, as in the scriptural passage "Higher than the high Imperishable" (Mund.Up .2.1.2), **and occasionally it is suggested to be the illusory power** (Māyā) thus – "You should know the Prakṛti (the cause) to be but the illusory power – Māyā (and not the Pradhāna of the Sāṅkhyas), and the Highest Lord as the master-illusionist" (Sve.Up. 4.10). It is this Māyā that is this 'undeveloped' (Avyakta), because it is not possible to predicate about it, that it either is different from it (i.e. Brahman) or not different from it.

अतोऽक्षरान्नामरूपबीजोपाधिलक्षितस्वरूपात् ।
सर्वकार्यकरणबीजत्वेनोपलक्ष्यमाणत्वात्परं तत्त्वं ।
तदुपाधिलक्षणमव्याकृताख्यमक्षरं सर्वविकारेभ्यतस्मात्परतोऽक्षरात्परः
निरुपाधिकः पुरुष इत्यर्थः । यस्मिंस्तदाकाशाख्यमक्षरं
संव्यवहारविषयमोतं च प्रोतं च

Mund.Up. 2.1.2 Bh.

Hence it (i.e. Brahman) is higher than the other indestructible called Avyakrita (Unmanifested) the nature of which is perceptible from its being conditioned by the seed of name and form and which, perceptible as the seed of all effects and accessories, is higher than all modifications. Therefore, the meaning is, Purusha (i.e. Brahman), the unconditioned, all pervasive entity is higher than even avyakrita (Unmanifested) that is superior (to its effects). It is being show how, again, can that Entity in which is interwoven the (other, lower) imperishable, called akasa, that enters as an object into all empirical dealings.

Section 103

References:

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन
तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन

ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते

BSBh. 2.1.27

Brahman appears to become susceptible of (i.e. appears to be the basis of) all phenomenal behaviour by way of modifications etc. By reason of the distinctions of aspects or forms **characterized by names and forms imagined through ignorance**, which are at once both evolved and unevolved, and about whom it is not possible to predicate that they either are or are not Brahman while in its truest nature Brahman subsists only in its unmodified aspect, and is beyond all phenomenal behaviour

प्रागुत्पत्तेः अव्याकृतनामरूपभेदमात्मभूतमात्मैकशब्दप्रत्ययगोचरं जगत् इदानीं
व्याकृतनामरूपभेदत्वादनेकशब्दप्रत्ययगोचरमात्मैकशब्दप्रत्ययगोचरं चेति विशेषः । यथा सलिलात्पृथक्
फेननामरूपव्याकरणात्प्राक्सलिलैकशब्दप्रत्ययगोचरमेव फेनम् , यदा सलिलात्पृथङ् नामरूपभेदेन व्याकृतं भवति, तदा सलिलं फेनं चेति अनेकशब्दप्रत्ययभाक् सलिलमेवेति चैकशब्दप्रत्ययभाक्च फेनं भवति, तद्वत्

Ait.Up. 1.1.1 Bh.

The universe in which the differences of name and form were not manifest before creation, which was then one

with the Self, and which was denotable by the single word and idea `Self', has now become denotable by many words and concepts as well as by the single word and concept `Self', because of its diversification through the multiplicity of names and forms. Foam is denoted by the single word and concept `water', before the manifestation of names and forms distinct from water; but when that foam becomes manifested as (an entity) distinct from water, owing to the difference of name and form, then the very same foam becomes denotable by many words and concepts, viz foam and water, as well as by only one word and one concept, viz water, like that.

यदा आत्मस्थे अनभिव्यक्ते नामरूपे व्याक्रियेते, तदा आत्मस्वरूपापरित्यागेनैव ब्रह्मणः अप्रविभक्तदेशकाले सर्वावस्थासु व्याक्रियेते । तदेतन्नामरूपव्याकरणं ब्रह्मणो बहुभवनम् । नान्यथा निरवयवस्य ब्रह्मणो बहुत्वापत्तिरुपपद्यते अल्पत्वं वा, यथा आकाशस्याल्पत्वं बहुत्वं च वस्त्वन्तरकृतमेव । अतः तद्द्वारेणैवात्मा बहु भवति । न ह्यात्मनोऽन्यदनात्मभूतं तत्प्रविभक्तदेशकालं सूक्ष्मं व्यवहितं विप्रकृष्टं भूतं भवद्भविष्यद्वा वस्तु विद्यते । अतः नामरूपे सर्वावस्थे ब्रह्मणैवात्मवती । न ब्रह्म तदात्मकम्

Tai.Up. 2.6.1 Bh.

When name and form existing latently in the Self get manifested, they evolve by retaining their intrinsic nature

as the Self under all conditions in time and space which are inseparable from Brahman.

Then that evolution of name and form is (what is called) the appearence of Brahman as the many. In no other way is it possible for the partless Brahman to become either multiple or finite; as for instance, the finitude and plurality of space are surely the creations of extraneous factors. Hence the Self becomes multiple through these alone. For no such subtle, disconnected and remote thing exists as a non-Self, in the past, present, or future, which is different from the Self and separated from It by time or space. Therefore, it is only because of Brahman that name and form have their being under all circumstances, but Brahman does not consist of them.

एतद्योनीनि एते परापरे क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञलक्षणे प्रकृती योनिः येषां भूतानां तानि एतद्योनीनि, भूतानि सर्वाणि इति एवम् उपधारय जानीहि । यस्मात् मम प्रकृती योनिः कारणं सर्वभूतानाम् , अतः अहं कृत्स्नस्य समस्तस्य जगतः प्रभवः उत्पत्तिः प्रलयः विनाशः तथा । प्रकृतिद्वयद्वारेण अहं सर्वज्ञः ईश्वरः जगतः कारणमित्यर्थः

BGh. 7.6

These two, the lower and the higher (natures), constituting the field and the field knower, are the womb of all beings. Do know this. Such being the case, the birth and dissolution

of the entire world are due to Me. I, the omniscient Lord, am the world cause through the medium of My two natures.

Section 104

References:

यदि वयं स्वतन्त्रां काञ्चित्प्रागवस्थां जगतः कारणत्वेनाभ्युपगच्छेम । प्रसञ्जयेम तदा प्रधानकारणवादम् । परमेश्वराधीना त्वियमस्माभिः प्रागवस्था जगतोऽभ्युपगम्यते, न स्वतन्त्रा । सा चावश्याभ्युपगन्तव्या ।

अर्थवती हि सा । न हि तया विना परमेश्वरस्य स्रष्टृत्वं सिध्यति । शक्तिरहितस्य तस्य प्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः। मुक्तानां च पुनरनुत्पत्तिः

BSBh. 1.4.3

If we were to understand any absolutely independent antecedent condition as such to be the cause of this transitory world, then perhaps it would mean, that the doctrine of the Pradhāna being the cause (of the transitory world) is thus arrived at (by us). But we understand this antecedent condition of the transitory world to be dependent on the Highest Lord, and not independent in any way. It must necessarily be so understood, because it is only in this way that it can have any meaning as without such supposition (of creationism), the creative activity of the Highest Lord is not established. And in the absence of any such power

inherent in the Highest Lord, neither his proceeding to create, nor the non-liability of those who have already attained liberation to be born again, would be reasonably sustainable.

अविद्यात्मिका हि सा बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या । परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुषुप्तिः

BSBh. 1.4.3

This potential power of the seed is of the nature of ignorance, and it is indicated by the word 'undeveloped' (Avyakta), and has the Highest Lord as its basis, and is of the nature of an illusion (Māyā) and is the great sleep.

अस्मात्कारणस्यात्मभूता शक्तिः, शक्तेश्चात्मभूतं कार्यम्

BSBh. 2.1.18

Therefore, this potentiality (Śakti) is the essential nature of the cause, and the essential nature of such potentiality, is the effect (which ultimately means that the cause, the potentiality and the effect are both one and the same thing).

नामरूपोपाध्यस्तित्वे 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्s (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चनs (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । १९) इति श्रुतयो विरुध्येरन्निति चेत् । न, सलिलफेनदृष्टान्तेन परिहृतत्वात् मृदादिदृष्टान्तैश्च ; यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या परमात्मतत्त्वात् श्रुत्यनुसारिभिः अन्यत्वेन निरूप्यमाणे नामरूपे मृदादिविकारवत् वस्त्वन्तरे तत्त्वतो न स्तः – सलिलफेनघटादिविकारवदेव । तदा तत् अपेक्ष्य 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्s

(छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चनऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । १९) इत्यादिपरमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । यदा तु स्वाभाविक्याविद्यया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनस्वरूपवदेव स्वेन रूपेण वर्तमानं केनचिदस्पृष्टस्वभावमपि सत् नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधार्यते, नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव च भवति स्वाभाविकी, तदा सर्वोऽयं वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वव्यवहारः । अस्ति चायं भेदकृतो मिथ्याव्यवहारः, येषां ब्रह्मतत्त्वादन्यत्वेन वस्तु विद्यते, येषां च नास्ति

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

Objection: Will not such Upaniṣadic texts as, 'One only without a second' (Chand.Up. 6.2.1), and 'There is no difference whatsoever in It' (Br.Up. 4.4.19), be contradicted if you admit the existence of the limiting adjuncts, name and form?

Reply: No; this has already been refuted by the illustrations of the foam of water and (the modifications of) clay etc. But when name and form are tested from the **standpoint of the highest truth in the light of the above Śruti texts, as to whether they are different from the Supreme Self or not, they cease to be separate entities, like the foam of water, or like the modifications (of clay) such as a jar.** It is then that such passages as, 'One only without a second,' and 'There is no difference whatsoever in It,' have scope from the standpoint of the Supreme Self as referring to the highest realisation. But when on account of our natural ignorance the reality of Brahman, although remaining as it is, essentially

untouched by anything–like the reality of the rope, the mother of pearl and the sky– is not discriminated from the limiting adjuncts such as the body and organs, which are created by name and form, and our natural vision of those adjuncts remains, then this phenomenal existence consisting of things different from Brahman has full play. This unreal phenomenal existence created by differentiation is indeed a fact for those who do not believe in things as different from Brahman as well as for those who do believe.

Section 105

References:

यथा ह्यविभागेऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहतः स्थितौ दृश्यते । एवमपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते

BSBh. 2.1.9

Just as, even though there is no differentiation in the Highest Self, still, under the binding influence of wrong-knowledge, such differentiated condition persists continuously, without let or hindrance, as in a dream even so, **the existence of a potential power of differentiation, due to the binding influence of wrong-**

knowledge, may be inferred as still surviving during the condition of resorption also.

विभागश्चाकाशस्य पृथिव्यादिभ्योऽवगम्यते । तस्मात्सोऽपि विकारो भवितुमर्हति ।

एतेन दिक्कालमनःपरमाण्वादीनां कार्यत्वं व्याख्यातम्

BSBh. 2.3.7

It is actually understood that the Ākāśa is distinct and separate from the earth etc., therefore, it also deserves to be an effect (i.e. a created entity). By all this, it is explained, that entities like the quarters, time, the mind, or the Paramāṇu etc. also, are effects or modifications.

'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (छन्।उप्। ३।१४।१)

इत्येवमाद्याभिर्हि श्रुतिभिरविशेषेण त्रिष्वपि कालेषु कार्यस्य कारणादनन्यत्वं श्राव्यते । तत्र यः परिहारः कार्यस्य तद्धर्माणां चाविद्याध्यारोपितत्वान्न तैः कारणं संसृज्यत इति, अपीतावपि स समानः । अस्ति चायमपरो दृष्टान्तः -

यथा स्वयं प्रसारितया मायया मायावी त्रिष्वपि कालेषु न संस्पृश्यते, अवस्तुत्वात् एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यत इति

BSBh. 2.1.9

"Verily all this is Brahman" (Chan.Up. 3.14.1),

Purport to say, that without exception **during all the three times (i.e. past, present and future), the effect is never different from the cause.** The refutation in such cases – viz. that as both the effect and its qualities are the result of superimposition through ignorance, the cause is not affected by them – is common to resorption also. There is this other illustration also. Just as an illusionist is never affected during all the three times, by the illusion projected by himself, in as much as it (i.e. the illusion) is insubstantial, even so, the Highest Self (Brahman) is never affected by the illusion of transmigratory existence.

यथा च स्वप्नदृगेकः स्वप्नदर्शनमायया न संस्पृश्यते ।
प्रबोधसम्प्रसादयोरनन्वागतत्वात् ।
एवमवस्थात्रयसाक्ष्येकोऽव्यभिचार्यवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृश्यते

BSBh. 2.1.9

Also, just as a person who experiences a dream is never affected by the illusory nature of the dream vision, in as much as it does not persist during the conditions of deep sleep and wakefulness even so, this one unchanging, constant and immediate witness of all the three conditions (viz. the Highest Self i.e. Brahman) is not affected by the three changing transmigratory conditions (of creation, preservation, and resorption).

तत्रैवं सति, यत्र यदध्यासः, तत्कृतेन दोषेण गुणेन वा अणुमात्रेणापि स न सम्बध्यते

BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya

This being so, that on which some other thing is superimposed is not in the least affected by the faults and merits of the thing superimposed.

Section 106

References:

येऽप्यात्मानोऽन्ये च धर्मा जायन्त इति कल्प्यन्ते, ते इति एवंप्रकारा यथोक्ता संवृतिर्निर्दिश्यत इति संवृत्यैव धर्मा जायन्ते । न ते तत्त्वतः परमार्थतः जायन्ते । यत्पुनस्तत्संवृत्या जन्म तेषां धर्माणां यथोक्तानां यथा मायया जन्म तथा तत् मायोपमं प्रत्येतव्यम् । माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि । नैवम् , सा च माया न विद्यते ।
मायेत्यविद्यमानस्याख्येत्यभिप्रायः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.58 Bh.

Those selves and other objects which are imagined to be born thus, are born from a relative plane (of thinking). The word ‘iti’ is indicative of the relative plane already mentioned. Thus, within the realm of ignorance (Samvriti pertains to ignorance, see 4.57) are they born and are not born in (Absolute) reality, for the birth of those objects mentioned above that takes place in the realm of

ignorance, is like that taking place through Maya. Hence it should be understood as similar to Maya.

Opponent: Then, is there a thing called Maya?

Reply: No. That Maya is non-existent. The drift is that it (i.e. Maya) is the name of something that does not exist (māyā iti avidyamānasya ākhyā).

न हि रज्ज्वां भ्रान्तिबुद्ध्या कल्पितः सर्पो विद्यमानः सन्विवेकतो निवृत्तः ; न च माया मायाविना प्रयुक्ता तद्दर्शिनां चक्षुर्बन्धापगमे विद्यमाना सती निवृत्ता ।
तथेदं प्रपञ्चाख्यं मायामात्रं द्वैतम् ; रज्जुवन्मायाविवच्च अद्वैतं परमार्थतः । तस्मान्न कश्चित्प्रपञ्चः प्रवृत्तो निवृत्तो वास्तीत्यभिप्रायः
Ma.Up.Ka. 1.17 Bh.

The snake superimposed on the rope through a deluded observation does not actually exist or ceases to be afterwards through discrimination, nor does the illusion conjured up by the juggler exist and then disappear, as it were, on lifting the veil of illusion that was cast before the eyes of the spectators. So, too, this duality called the phenomenal world is nothing but Maya, it is the non-dual that really is, like the rope and the juggler. Therefore, the drift is that there is no such world which appears or disappears.

अविद्यावतः अविद्यानिवृत्त्यनिवृत्तिकृतः विशेषः आत्मनः स्यादिति चेत् न, अविद्याकल्पनाविषयत्वाभ्युपगमात् , रज्जूषरशुक्तिकागगनानां सर्पोदकरजतमलिनत्वादिवत् , अदोष इत्यवोचाम

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: **There will be some difference in thé self that is under ignorance, due to the cessation or continuance of that ignorance**.

Reply: No; **we have already said that it is admitted being the creation of ignorance**, **like a rope, a desert, a mother of pearl and the sky appearing as a snake, water, silver, and blue respectively.**

न जानेऽहं त्वदुक्तं मुग्ध एव इति चेत् ?

भवतु अज्ञो मुग्धः, यस्तु एवंदर्शी, तं ज्ञम् अमुग्धं प्रतिजानीमहे वयम्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: Well, we have referred to the person who says, 'I do not know what you say, I am confused.' What do you say to that?

Reply: Let him regard himself as ignorant and confused; we, however, accept one who sees like this as knowing and possessed of a clear perception (understanding).

Section 107

References:

यदि हि भूतत एव सृष्टिः स्यात् , ततः सत्यमेव नानावस्त्विति तदभावप्रदर्शनार्थ आम्नायो न स्यात् ; अस्ति च 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (क। उ। २ । १ । ११) इत्याम्नायो द्वैतभावप्रतिषेधार्थः ; तस्मादात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्था कल्पिता सृष्टिरभूतैव प्राणसंवादवत् । 'इन्द्रो मायाभिः' (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) इत्यभूतार्थप्रतिपादकेन मायाशब्देन व्यपदेशात् । ननु प्रज्ञावचनो मायाशब्दः । सत्यम् , इन्द्रियप्रज्ञाया अविद्यामयत्वेन मायात्वाभ्युपगमाददोषः । मायाभिः इन्द्रियप्रज्ञाभिरविद्यारूपाभिरित्यर्थः । 'अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते' (तै। आ। ३ । १३) इति श्रुतेः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.24 Bh.

If creation were a reality, then the existence of diverse things too would be a reality and also there would not have sprung up instructions to disprove their reality, But, in fact, there is the instruction such as, "There is no difference here" (Katha Upa.2.1.11) and the like, intended for refuting the existence of duality. Therefore, creation which has been imagined helping the apprehension of the non-duality of the Self, is certainly unreal like the dialogue with prana (already mentioned). This is further evidenced by the usage of the word Maya in the sense of unreality in the sruti-passage, "The Lord, owing to Maya, (is seen diversely) (Br.Up. 2.5.19).

Objection: The word Maya indicates knowledge.
Reply: True. Yet it is free from evil, since sensory knowledge is regarded **as Maya (ie. illusory), as is the outcome of ignorance.**
Mayabhih: through various kinds of sensory knowledge of the nature of ignorance, as declared by the sruti, “Though unborn, It appears as though born in many ways”.

स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।
तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचक्षणैः
Ma.Up.Ka. 2.31 (Karika)
As are dreams and illusions or a castle in the air seen in the sky, so is the universe viewed by the wise in the Vedānta.

यदेतद्द्वैतस्यासत्त्वमुक्तं युक्तितः, तदेतद्वेदान्तप्रमाणावगतमित्याह – स्वप्नश्च माया च स्वप्नमाये असद्वस्त्वात्मिके सत्यौ सद्वस्त्वात्मिके इव लक्ष्येते अविवेकिभिः । यथा च प्रसारितपण्यापणगृहप्रासादस्त्रीपुञ्जनपदव्यवहाराकीर्णमिव गन्धर्वनगरं दृश्यमानमेव सत् अकस्मादभावतां गतं दृष्टम् , यथा च स्वप्नमाये दृष्टे असद्रूपे, तथा विश्वमिदं द्वैतं समस्तमसद्दृष्टम् । क्वेत्याह – वेदान्तेषु, ‘नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन’ (क। उ। २ । १ । ११) ‘इन्द्रो मायाभिः’ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) ‘आत्मैवेदमग्र आसीत्’ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १) ‘ब्रह्मैवेदमग्र आसीत्’ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) ‘द्वितीयाद्वै भयं भवति’ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । २) ‘न तु तद्द्वितीयमस्ति’ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ ।

२३) ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्’ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यादिषु विचक्षणैः निपुणतरवस्तुदर्शिभिः पण्डितैरित्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.31 Bh.

What is said to be the unreality of the duality in light of reasoning is also derived from the valid proof Vedanta-texts. By men devoid of discrimination dream and magic which are non-existent, i.e. unreal, are seem as though real. Just as in imaginary city in the sky seen as though filled with large shops displaying vendable articles, houses, mansions, men and women engaged in (various) transactions, suddenly becomes vanished as one looks on, like dream and magic which are seen to be unreal, so also is this universe, the whole of duality, seen as unreal. Where (is it thus seen)? Through the passages such as, “There is no difference here whatsoever” (Katha Up. 2.1.11), “The Lord, due to Maya appears as manifold” (Br.Up. 2.5.19), “This was but the Self, the One, in the beginning” (Br.Up. 1.4.1), “In the beginning this was indeed Brahman” (Br.Up. 1.4.10), “Fear arises indeed from a second entity’ (Br.Up. 1.4.2), "But there is not that second thing” (Br.Up. 4.3.23), “But, when the Self has become everything to the man of realisation” (Br.Up. 4.5.15) etc., the enlightened ones, i.e., those who perceive (intuit) the real nature of things, have declared (the unreality of duality).

Section 108

References:

नाचेतनं लोके चेतनानधिष्ठितं स्वतन्त्रं
किञ्चिद्विशिष्टपुरुषार्थनिर्वर्तनसमर्थान्विकारान्विरचयद्दृष्टम्

BSBh. 2.2.1

(We may point out that) in the ordinary world no non-sentient thing, independently and without being guided by some sentient entity, is seen to be able to bring about any modifications or effects, which are able to fulfil any particular purpose of man.

आस्तां तावदियं रचना । तत्सिद्ध्यर्था या प्रवृत्तिः -
साम्यावस्थानात्प्रच्युतिः, सत्त्वरजस्तमसामङ्गाङ्गिभावरूपापत्तिः,
विशिष्टकार्याभिमुखप्रवृत्तिता - सापि नाचेतनस्य प्रधानस्य
स्वतन्त्रस्योपपद्यते । मृदादिष्वदर्शनाद्रथादिषु च

BSBh. 2.2.2

Let this (discussion about a) proper design or arrangement wait (for the time being). It is not reasonably sustainable that the non-sentient Pradhāna could independently by itself ever at all secure the necessary disturbance in its perfectly balanced condition of equipoise of Sattva, Rajas, Tamas (the three constituents of

Pradhāna) i.e., by their converting themselves into a condition of reciprocal superiority or inferiority with regard to each other, And its acquiring the necessary tendency towards accomplishing any particular effect, because it is not to be seen, either in the case of (such non-sentient things as) clay etc. or a chariot etc.

सांख्यानां त्रयो गुणाः साम्येनावतिष्ठमानाः प्रधानम् । न तु तद्व्यतिरेकेण प्रधानस्य प्रवर्तकं निवर्तकं वा किञ्चिद्बाह्यमपेक्ष्यमवस्थितमस्ति । पुरुषस्तूदासीनो न प्रवर्तको न निवर्तकः - इत्यतोऽनपेक्षं प्रधानम् ।

अनपेक्षत्वाच्च कदाचित्प्रधानं महदाद्याकारेण परिणमते, कदाचिन्न परिणमते, इत्येतदयुक्तम्

BSBh. 2.2.4

According to the Sāṅkhyas, their three Guṇas existing in perfectly balanced equipoise, mean the Pradhāna. But barring that, there is nothing which is expected as existing outside or apart from it, which has a capacity to induce a tendency or to prevent any tendency arising, in the Pradhāna. The Puruṣa is passive i.e. apathetic (and according to the Sāṅkhyas takes no part in creation) and as such, has neither the capacity to induce, or to prevent any such tendency (in Pradhāna) and hence, Pradhāna having nothing else on which it can depend It is not

reasonable (To say) that it sometimes does, and at other times does not, modify itself into the form of 'Mahat' (greatness) etc.

न ह्यचेतनं चेतनेनानधिष्ठितं स्वतन्त्रं प्रवर्तते प्रवर्तयति वेति सांख्यप्रक्रियायामभिहितम् । आत्मनश्चानुत्पन्नचैतन्यस्य तस्यामवस्थायामचेतनत्वात् । आत्मसमवायित्वाभ्युपगमाच्च नादृष्टमणुषु कर्मणो निमित्तं स्यात्, असम्बन्धात्

BSBh. 2.2.12

It has already been remarked during the refutation of the Sāṅkhya theory, that no non-sentient entity which is not guided by a sentient entity, can either act independently or cause any activity (in any other entity), because during that condition (of Pralaya) the Jīva-Self, in which sentiency has not till then become manifest, is non-sentient. Besides even if the unseen principle is understood to be inherent in the Jīva-Self, then in the absence of the necessary relation of conjunction between the unseen principle and the atoms, the unseen principle cannot be the cause of activity in an atom (Aṇu).

अपि चाणवः प्रवृत्तिस्वभावा वा, निवृत्तिस्वभावा वा, उभयस्वभावा वा, अनुभयस्वभावा वा अभ्युपगम्यन्ते – गत्यन्तराभावात् ; चतुर्धापि

नोपपद्यते – प्रवृत्तिस्वभावत्वे नित्यमेव प्रवृत्तेर्भावात्प्रलयाभावप्रसङ्गः ;
निवृत्तिस्वभावत्वेऽपि नित्यमेव निवृत्तेर्भावात्सर्गाभावप्रसङ्गः ;
उभयस्वभावत्वं च विरोधादसमञ्जसम् ; अनुभयस्वभावत्वे तु
निमित्तवशात्प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्त्योरभ्युपगम्यमानयोरदृष्टादेर्निमित्तस्य
नित्यसन्निधानान्नित्यप्रवृत्तिप्रसङ्गः,
अतन्त्रत्वेऽप्यदृष्टादेर्नित्याप्रवृत्तिप्रसङ्गः । तस्मादप्यनुपपन्नः
परमाणुकारणवादः

BSBh. 2.2.14

Besides, atoms (Aṇus) have necessarily to be understood to have the nature, either of a tendency for activity or inactivity, or of both or neither, as no other alternative is possible. But none of these four kinds (of possibilities) is reasonably sustainable. If their nature is that of a tendency for activity. Such activity would continue eternally, and there would be the predicament of the absence of final dissolution. If their nature is of inactivity, as such inactivity also would continue eternally, there would be the predicament of the absence of any creation. Their having both these natures at one and the same time, would be, because of the contradiction (involved), incongruous. If it be supposed, that they have neither of these natures, and that a tendency for activity or inactivity depends upon a cause, a cause such as the unseen principle (assumed by the Vaiśeṣikas to be such a cause,

albeit wrongly, as shown before), being constantly available i.e. near at hand, such a tendency for activity would be eternal, leading to the predicament of constant activity (making final dissolution impossible). Now, supposing the unseen principle is not accepted (by the Vaiśeṣikas as a part of their theory) the predicament of constant inactivity would result. For these reasons also, the theory of atoms being the cause (of the world) is not reasonably sustainable.

ननु शब्देनापि न शक्यते विरुद्धोऽर्थः प्रत्याययितुम् - निरवयवं च ब्रह्म परिणमते न च कृत्स्नमिति । यदि निरवयवं ब्रह्म स्यात्, नैव परिणमेत, कृत्स्नमेव वा परिणमेत । अथ केनचिद्रूपेण परिणमेत केनचिच्चावतिष्ठेतेति, रूपभेदकल्पनात्सावयवमेव प्रसज्येत

BSBh. 2.1.27

But (says the opponent) things which are contradictory – as for instance, that Brahman which is without parts, modifies itself but not entirely – cannot be realized even on the authority of the scriptures. If, Brahman is (in fact) without parts, it will either not modify itself at all, or modify itself entirely. If it were to be supposed that it has different aspects, so that it modifies itself in some of its

aspects and remains unmodified in some other of its aspects, it would mean necessarily that it has parts.

परमात्मनस्तु स्वरूपव्यपाश्रयमौदासीन्यम्, मायाव्यपाश्रयं च प्रवर्तकत्वम् - इत्यस्त्यतिशयः

BSBh. 2.2.7

In the case of the Highest Self, however, its tendency towards creation depends upon its association with its power of Māyā, and apathy of its own nature, and that is where there is this peculiarity (Atiśaya) in the case of the Highest Self.

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन

ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते

BSBh. 2.1.27

Brahman appears to become susceptible of (i.e. appears to be the basis of) all phenomenal behaviour by way of modifications etc. By reason of the distinctions of aspects or forms characterized by names and forms imagined through ignorance, which are at once both evolved and unevolved, and about whom it is not possible to predicate

that they either are or are not Brahman, while in its truest nature Brahman subsists only in its unmodified aspect, and is beyond all phenomenal behaviour

Section 109

References:

ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्

Brahma Sutra 1.1.5

On account of thinking – (Pradhāna) is not (the cause) – (it is) not based on the Scriptures

न सांख्यपरिकल्पितमचेतनं प्रधानं जगतः कारणं शक्यं वेदान्तेष्वाश्रयितुम्। अशब्दं हि तत् । कथमशब्दत्वम् ? ईक्षतेः ईक्षितृत्वश्रवणात्कारणस्य

BSBh. 1.1.5

In Vedānta, it is not possible to accept the non-intelligent Pradhāna as contemplated by the Sāṅkhyas, to be the cause of the transient world. It is not mentioned in the scriptures. How is it not mentioned in the scriptures? Because of the word 'thinking'. Because the scriptures refer to 'thinking' on the part of the cause (of the transient world).

इदानीं केवलाधिष्ठात्रीश्वरकारणवादः प्रतिषिध्यते । तत्कथमवगम्यते ? ‘ प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्ऽ (ब्र। सू। १ । ४ । २३) ‘ अभिध्योपदेशाच्चऽ (ब्र। सू। १ । ४ । २४) इत्यत्र प्रकृतिभावेन अधिष्ठातृभावेन च उभयस्वभावस्येश्वरस्य स्वयमेव आचार्येण प्रतिष्ठापितत्वात् ; यदि पुनरविशेषेणेश्वरकारणवादमात्रमिह प्रतिषिध्येत, पूर्वोत्तरविरोधाद्व्याहताभिव्याहारः सूत्रकार इत्येतदापद्येत ; तस्मादप्रकृतिरधिष्ठाता केवलं निमित्तकारणमीश्वरः – इत्येष पक्षो वेदान्तविहितब्रह्मैकत्वप्रतिपक्षत्वात् यत्नेनात्र प्रतिषिध्यते । सा चेयं वेदबाह्येश्वरकल्पना अनेकप्रकारा

BSBh. 2.2.37

Now the doctrine (of the Māheśvaras) that the Lord is (the cause of the world) merely as a superintendent, is being refuted. How is it understood that the Sūtra means this? Because, elsewhere by Brahma Sutra 1.4.23 and 1.4.24, the Ācārya has already established that the Lord, by virtue of his being both the material and efficient cause, has both these natures. And now if this Sūtra were to be understood to refute the doctrine of the Lord being the cause, without any further qualification then it would mean, that the Sūtrakāra has stultified himself by saying something contrary to what he has said before (as a result of the contradiction involved in the former and later statement). Therefore, the doctrine that the Lord is not the material cause (Aprakṛti), but only a

superintendent, i.e. merely an efficient cause is being refuted here with special effort, because it is opposed to the doctrine of the unity (Ekatva) of Brahman as propounded by the Vedānta. This extra-Vedic concept of the Lord is of various sorts.

पारिशेष्याद्ब्रह्मणोऽन्यदुपादानकारणमशुद्ध्यादिगुणकं स्मृतिप्रसिद्धमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् , ब्रह्मकारणत्वश्रुतेर्निमित्तत्वमात्रे पर्यवसानादित्येवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः –

प्रकृतिश्चोपादानकारणं च ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम् , निमित्तकारणं च । न केवलं निमित्तकारणमेव । कस्मात् ? प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् । एवं हि प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ श्रौतौ नोपरुध्येते । प्रतिज्ञा तावत् – 'उत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यः येनाश्रुत श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ३) इति ; तत्र चैकेन विज्ञातेन सर्वमन्यदविज्ञातमपि विज्ञातं भवतीति प्रतीयते ; तच्चोपादानकारणविज्ञाने सर्वविज्ञानं सम्भवति, उपादानकारणाव्यतिरेकात्कार्यस्य ; निमित्तकारणाव्यतिरेकस्तु कार्यस्य नास्ति, लोके तक्ष्णः प्रासादव्यतिरेकदर्शनात् । दृष्टान्तोऽपि 'यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञात स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ४) इत्युपादानकारणगोचर एवाम्नायते

BSBh. 1.4.23

Therefore, the only alternative that remains is that some such cause of an impure nature as is known from the

Smṛti (Sāṅkhya Smṛti) and which is other than Brahman should be understood to be the material cause, because the scriptural statement about Brahman being a cause (of the world) culminates in indicating it to be only an accidental cause. To this conclusion (of the opponent) we reply: – **Brahman should be understood to be both the material cause and the operative cause**, and not only an operative cause, because (understood that way alone) there is no conflict between the scriptural solemn statement (Pratijñā, 'the proposition') and the illustration (dṛṣṭānta). It is in this way that a conflict between the scriptural solemn statement and the illustration does not take place. The solemn statement for instance is: – "Have you by any chance asked (him) for the instruction of that, by means of which that which is not heard becomes heard, that which is not perceived becomes perceived, and that which is not known becomes known?" (ChanU.6.1.2), and from that it is understood, that by the knowledge of one, all else which is not known, becomes known. That knowledge of everything, is possible, only by knowing the material cause, because a modification is non-different from its material cause, while no such non-difference of the modification from the cause is seen in the case of an accidental cause because in the ordinary

world an architect (lit., a carpenter) is seen to be different from the palace (he builds). The illustration also on the other hand – "Just as, Oh mild one, by knowing a clod of earth, every other thing made of earth becomes known, modification is but only a name which is made current by speech, and the essential truth is that (the modification) is but merely the earth, in fact" – as given by the Scriptures is indicative of the material cause.

Section 110

References:

न हि प्रधानपुरुषव्यतिरिक्त ईश्वरोऽन्तरेण सम्बन्धं प्रधानपुरुषयोरीशिता ; न तावत्संयोगलक्षणः सम्बन्धः सम्भवति, प्रधानपुरुषेश्वराणां सर्वगतत्वान्निरवयवत्वाच्च ; नापि समवायलक्षणः सम्बन्धः, आश्रयाश्रयिभावानिरूपणात् ; नाप्यन्यः कश्चित्कार्यगम्यः सम्बन्धः शक्यते कल्पयितुम् , कार्यकारणभावस्यैवाद्याप्यसिद्धत्वात् । ब्रह्मवादिनः कथमिति चेत् , न ; तस्य तादात्म्यलक्षणसम्बन्धोपपत्तेः

BSBh. 2.2.38

Again (the fault of) incongruity (does occur). The Lord who is different from the Pradhāna and the Puruṣa, cannot be their superintendent in the absence of any relation subsisting between them and the Lord. In the first place, there could not be a relation by way of contact

(Saṃyoga) between them because the Pradhāna, the Puruṣa and the Lord are all without any parts and all-pervading. Nor can a relation of inherence (Samavāya) subsist. As it is not possible to say that the Lord is the abode and the other two have their abode in the Lord (like a piece of cloth and its threads). And as it is not yet established that the Lord is the cause of the other two which are his effects, it is not possible to imagine any other relation (between them) which can be understood from the effects because even the existence of a relation of cause and effect (between them) has not yet been established.

Objection: How is it in the case of those who are the adherents of the doctrine of Brahman?

Reply: There is no difficulty in our system. In our system, a relation of the nature of complete identity (Tād-ātmya) (between them i.e. the Lord and His illusion-causing power, Māyā) is reasonably sustainable.

साधिष्ठानो हि लोके सशरीरो राजा राष्ट्रस्येश्वरो दृश्यते, न निरधिष्ठानः ; अतश्च तद्दृष्टान्तवशेनादृष्टमीश्वरं कल्पयितुमिच्छतः ईश्वरस्यापि किञ्चिच्छरीरं करणायतनं वर्णयितव्यं स्यात् ; न च तद्वर्णयितुं शक्यते, सृष्ट्युत्तरकालभावित्वाच्छरीरस्य,

प्राक्सृष्टेस्तदनुपपत्तेः ; निरधिष्ठानत्वे चेश्वरस्य प्रवर्तकत्वानुपपत्तिः, एवं लोके दृष्टत्वात्

BSBh. 2.2.40

In the ordinary world, for instance, it is as one possessing the support of a body, that a king is observed to be the ruler of the nation, and not as one without any such physical basis. So, he who would infer the Lord on the strength of such parallel instance, would have to explain how the Lord comes to be possessed of a body as an abode of the sense-organs. But it is not possible to explain it that way, because a body can come into existence only after creation takes place, and prior to such creation, the existence of a body is not reasonably sustainable. And if the Lord has no such physical basis (such as a body) it is not reasonably sustainable that he could be the promoter (of the world), because that is how it is observed to be, in the ordinary world.

इतश्चानुपपत्तिस्तार्किकपरिकल्पितस्येश्वरस्य – स हि सर्वज्ञस्तैरभ्युपगम्यतेऽनन्तश्च ; अनन्तं च प्रधानम् , अनन्ताश्च पुरुषा मिथो भिन्ना अभ्युपगम्यन्ते । तत्र सर्वज्ञेनेश्वरेण प्रधानस्य पुरुषाणामात्मनश्चेयत्ता परिच्छिद्येत वा, न वा परिच्छिद्येत ? उभयथापि दोषोऽनुषक्त एव । कथम् ? पूर्वस्मिंस्तावद्विकल्पे, इयत्तापरिच्छिन्नत्वात्प्रधानपुरुषेश्वराणामन्तवत्त्वमवश्यंभावि, एवं लोके

दृष्टत्वात् ; यद्धि लोके इयत्तापरिच्छिन्नं वस्तु घटादि, तदन्तवद्दृष्टम् – तथा प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरत्रयमपीयत्तापरिच्छिन्नत्वादन्तवत्स्यात् ; संख्यापरिमाणं तावत्प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरत्रयरूपेण परिच्छिन्नम् ; स्वरूपपरिमाणमपि तद्गतमीश्वरेण परिच्छिद्येत, पुरुषगता च महासंख्या । ततश्चेयत्तापरिच्छिन्नानां मध्ये ये संसारान्मुच्यन्ते, तेषां संसारोऽन्तवान् , संसारित्वं च तेषामन्तवत् ; एवमितरेष्वपि क्रमेण मुच्यमानेषु संसारस्य संसारिणां च अन्तवत्त्वं स्यात् ; प्रधानं च सविकारं पुरुषार्थमीश्वरस्य अधिष्ठेयं संसारित्वेनाभिमतम् । तच्छून्यतायाम् ईश्वरः किमधितिष्ठेत् ? किंविषये वा सर्वज्ञतेश्वरते स्याताम् ? प्रधानपुरुषेश्वराणाम् चैवमन्तवत्त्वे सति आदिमत्त्वप्रसङ्गः ; आद्यन्तवत्त्वे च शून्यवादप्रसङ्गः । अथ मा भूदेष दोष इत्युत्तरो विकल्पोऽभ्युपगम्येत – न प्रधानस्य पुरुषाणामात्मनश्च इयत्ता ईश्वरेण परिच्छिद्यत इति ; तत ईश्वरस्य सर्वज्ञत्वाभ्युपगमहानिरपरो दोषः प्रसज्येत । तस्मादप्यसङ्गतस्तार्किकपरिगृहीत ईश्वरकारणवादः

BSBh. 2.2.41

The hypothesis of the argumentative philosophers (Tārkikas, Logicians) is invalid, for the following reason also. They teach that the Lord is omniscient and of infinite duration, and likewise that the pradhāna, as well as the individual souls, is of infinite duration. Now, the omniscient Lord either defines the measure of the pradhāna, the souls, and himself, or does not define it. Both alternatives subvert the doctrine under discussion. For, on the former alternative, the pradhāna, the souls,

and the Lord, being all of them of definite measure, must necessarily be of finite duration; since ordinary experience teaches that all things of definite extent, such as jars and the like, at some time cease to exist. The numerical measure of pradhāna, souls, and Lord is defined by their constituting a triad, and the individual measure of each of them must likewise be considered as defined by the Lord (because he is omniscient). The number of the souls is a high one. From among this limited number of souls some obtain release from the saṃsāra, that means their saṃsāra comes to an end, and their subjection to the samsāra comes to an end. Gradually all souls obtain release, and so there will finally be an end of the entire saṃsāra and the saṃsāra state of all souls. But the pradhāna which is ruled by the Lord and which modifies itself for the purposes of the soul is what is meant by saṃsāra. Hence, when the latter no longer exists, nothing is left for the Lord to rule, and his omniscience and ruling power have no longer any objects. But if the pradhāna, the souls, and the Lord, all have an end, it follows that they also have a beginning, and if they have a beginning as well as an end, we are driven to the doctrine of a general void. Let us then, in order to avoid these untoward conclusions, maintain the second

alternative, i.e. that the measure of the Lord himself, the pradhāna, and the souls, is not defined by the Lord. But that also is impossible, because it would compel us to abandon a tenet granted at the outset, viz. that the Lord is omniscient. For all these reasons the doctrine of the argumentative philosophers (Tārkikas, Logicians), according to which the Lord is the operative cause of the world, appears unacceptable.

अपि च आगमबलेन ब्रह्मवादी कारणादिस्वरूपं निरूपयतीति नावश्यं तस्य यथादृष्टमेव सर्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यमिति नियमोऽस्ति ; परस्य तु दृष्टान्तबलेन कारणादिस्वरूपं निरूपयतः यथादृष्टमेव सर्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यमित्ययमस्त्यतिशयः । परस्यापि सर्वज्ञप्रणीतागमसद्भावात् समानमागमबलमिति चेत् , न ; इतरेतराश्रयप्रसङ्गात् – आगमप्रत्ययात्सर्वज्ञत्वसिद्धिः सर्वज्ञत्वप्रत्ययाच्चागमसिद्धिरिति

BSBh. 2.2.38

Besides, as the adherents of the doctrine of Brahman, explain the nature of the cause etc., on the authority of the scriptures, there could be no rule, by which he would be obliged to understand all things, only, as he perceives them. There is a special obligation on the opponent of the Vedānta (the Sāṅkhya) to understand things as he perceives them, as he explains the nature of the cause

etc., on the strength of an illustration (Dṛṣṭānta) i.e. a parallel instance.

Objection: The authority of the Āgama (as propounded by Kapila etc.) is equally available to him as the Āgama is promulgated by the Omniscient one,

Reply: No, in his case there occurs the predicament of the fault of mutual interdependence, the omniscience of the Lord being established on the doctrine of scripture, and the authority of scripture again being established on the omniscience of the Lord.

Section 111

References:

चेतनं ब्रह्मैकमद्वितीयं जगतः कारणमिति यदुक्तम्, तन्नोपपद्यते

BSBh. 2.1.24

What is said by the opponent – viz., the statement (by the Vedāntin) that sentient Brahman, which is alone without a second, is the cause of the world – is not reasonably sustainable.

कस्मात् ? उपसंहारदर्शनात्।

BSBh. 2.1.24

Whence is it so? Because it is seen that there is preparation or assemblage (of means).

इह हि लोके कुलालादयो घटपटादीनां कर्तारो

मृद्दण्डचक्रसूत्रसलिलाद्यनेककारकोपसंहारेण सङ्गृहीतसाधनाः सन्तः

तत्तत्कार्यं कुर्वाणा दृश्यन्ते

BSBh. 2.1.24

In the ordinary world, it is observed that potters (and weavers) etc., the manufacturers of pots and cloth etc.,

Accomplish those different things, after furnishing themselves with the necessary means or implements, by assembling together clay, staff, wheel and threads, etc., and many such causal agents,

ब्रह्म चासहायं तवाभिप्रेतम्

BSBh. 2.1.24

while you maintain that Brahman is without any such help.

तस्य साधनान्तरानुपसङ्ग्रहे सति कथं स्रष्टृत्वमुपपद्येत ?

BSBh. 2.1.24

Hence how can it be reasonably sustainable, that Brahman, which you understand to have no such helpful means, can have the ability to create in the absence of any such assemblage of means?

तस्मान्न ब्रह्म जगत्कारणमिति चेत्

BSBh. 2.1.24

Ergo, Brahman could not be the cause of the world.

नैष दोषः; यतः क्षीरवद्द्रव्यस्वभावविशेषादुपपद्यते -

BSBh. 2.1.24

(To this, we reply) – This is no fault. It is reasonably so sustainable, because Brahman, like milk, is a special peculiar material (Dravya).

यथा हि लोके क्षीरं जलं वा स्वयमेव दधिहिमकरकादिभावेन परिणमतेऽनपेक्ष्य बाह्यं साधनम्

BSBh. 2.1.24

Just as in the ordinary world, milk and water, by themselves undergo modifications into curds and snow respectively without expecting any extraneous means,

तथेहापि भविष्यति

BSBh. 2.1.24

Even so, it might be the case here (i.e. in the case of Brahman).

ननु क्षीराद्यपि दध्यादिभावेन परिणममानमपेक्षत एव बाह्यं साधनमौष्ण्यादिकम्; कथमुच्यते 'क्षीरवद्धि' इति ?

BSBh. 2.1.24

(If the opponent says) How do you say that the case is analogous to milk, when even milk etc. do require such outside help as heat etc.?

नैष दोषः; स्वयमपि हि क्षीरं यां च यावतीं च परिणाममात्रामनुभवत्येव त्वार्यते त्वौष्ण्यादिना दधिभावाय;

BSBh. 2.1.24

(We reply) – this is no fault, because whatever modification milk undergoes in turning into curds is by itself only, and whatever potentiality or the limit of potentiality which milk has in itself for the modificatory process of conversion into curds is but merely accelerated by heat etc., that is all.

यदि च स्वयं दधिभावशीलता न स्यात्

BSBh. 2.1.24

Because, were milk not to possess in itself this potentiality of modifying itself into curds,

नैवौष्ण्यादिनापि बलाद्दधिभावमापद्येत

BSBh. 2.1.24

It would never undergo such modification per force alone, by means of heat etc.

न हि वायुराकाशो वा औष्ण्यादिना बलाद्दधिभावमापद्यते

BSBh. 2.1.24

Ākāśa and Vāyu, for instance, do not modify themselves per force into curds, by heat etc.,

साधनसामग्र्या च तस्य पूर्णता सम्पाद्यते

BSBh. 2.1.24

And (in the case of milk) its capacity (for modification) is merely perfected by the assemblage of means.

परिपूर्णशक्तिकं तु ब्रह्म;

BSBh. 2.1.24

Brahman on the other hand is fully powerful by itself,

न तस्यान्येन केनचित्पूर्णता सम्पादयितव्या

BSBh. 2.1.24

And nothing else is necessary to make its capacity perfect.

श्रुतिश्च भवति - 'न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते । परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च' (Sve.Up. 6.8) इति।

BSBh. 2.1.24

For the Scriptures say – "There is nothing that it has to create, nor has it any extraneous instrument or means, (it may also mean – it i.e. Brahman has neither a body nor any sense-organ), nothing equal to or greater than it, is to be seen, And its powers are (seen to be) manifold and transcendental, and it has the natural power to know all things and to regulate and overcome everything by its mere presence" (Sve.Up. 6.8).

तस्मादेकस्यापि ब्रह्मणो विचित्रशक्तियोगात् क्षीरादिवद्विचित्रपरिणाम उपपद्यते

BSBh. 2.1.24

Therefore, only one, as Brahman is, that it has diverse powers inherent in itself, and that it can, like milk, modify itself in diverse ways, is reasonably sustainable.

Section 112

References:

यथा लोकेदेवाः पितर ऋषय इत्येवमादयो महाप्रभावाश्चेतना अपि सन्तोऽनपेक्ष्यैव किञ्चिद्बाह्यं साधनमैश्वर्यविशेषयोगादभिध्यानमात्रेण स्वत एव बहूनि नानासंस्थानानि शरीराणि प्रासादादीनि रथादीनि च निर्मिमाणा उपलभ्यन्ते, मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहासपुराणप्रामाण्यात् ।
तन्तुनाभश्च स्वत एव तन्तून्सृजति

BSBh. 2.1.25

Just as in the ordinary world, it is understood on the authority of Veda, Mantras, history and Purāṇas, that Gods, the manes and sages etc., very powerful and sentient as they are, and unaided by extraneous means as they are, are seen to create bodies of different sorts, and chariots and palaces etc. merely by themselves by means of their special power and by mere meditation, and by mere volition, or just as a spider produces its own threads itself,

एवं चेतनमति ब्रह्म अनपेक्ष्यैव बाह्यं साधनं स्वत एव जगत्स्रक्ष्यति

BSBh. 2.1.25

Even so, Brahman, sentient as it is, may, well by itself, create the world unaided by any extraneous means.

यथा हि कुलालादीनां देवादीनां च समाने चेतनत्वे कुलालादयः कार्यारम्भे बाह्यं साधनमपेक्षन्ते, न देवादयः । तथा ब्रह्म चेतनमपि न बाह्यं साधनमपेक्षिष्यत इत्येतावद्वयं देवाद्युदाहरणेन विवक्षामः । तस्माद्यथैकस्य सामर्थ्यं दृष्टं तथा सर्वेषामेव भवितुमर्हतीति नास्त्येकान्त इत्यभिप्रायः

BSBh. 2.1.25

Just as, though sentiency is common both to the potter and the Gods, it is only the potter etc. that need extraneous means (to help them) in doing their work, but not so the Gods, even so, all that we wish to say by the illustration of the Gods, is that sentient Brahman, also need not require any extraneous means (to help it in creating the world). What we therefore mean, is, that it is not an invariable rule, that just as a particular power is observed to exist in one thing, similarly all other things also must necessarily have the same power.

सर्वशक्तियुक्ता च परा देवतेत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । कुतः? तद्दर्शनात्। तथा हि दर्शयति श्रुतिः सर्वशक्तियोगं परस्या देवतायाः - 'सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादरः' (छन्।उप्। ३।१४।४)
'सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः' (छन्।उप्। ८।७।१), 'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्' (मुन्।उप्। १।१।९),
'एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।८।९) इत्येवंजातीयका

BSBh. 2.1.30

It has necessarily to be understood that this Highest deity is equipped with all powers. Whence is it so? Because it is seen (from scriptures) that it has all such powers, thus – "He, to whom all actions, all desires, all smells, all tastes belong, who is immanent in i.e., occupies all this (world appearance), who has no speech and who is indifferent and calm" (Chan.Up. 3.14.4); "His desires are true, his resolutions are true" (Chan.Up. 8.7.1); Who is omniscient and who cognizes everything" (Mun.Up. 1.1.9); "Oh Gārgi, it is at the behest of him who is unperishable that the sun and the moon hold themselves suspended in position (in space)" (Br.Up. 3.8.9).

परिपूर्णशक्तिकं तु ब्रह्म ; न तस्यान्येन केनचित्पूर्णता सम्पादयितव्या ; श्रुतिश्च भवति – ' न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न

तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते । परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया चऽ (श्वे। उ। ६ । ८) इति

BSBh. 2.1.24

Brahman on the other hand is fully powerful by itself, and nothing else is necessary to make its capacity perfect. For the Scriptures say – "There is nothing that it has to create, nor has it any extraneous instrument or means, (it may also mean – it i.e., Brahman has neither a body nor any sense-organ), nothing equal to or greater than it, is to be seen. And its powers are (seen to be) manifold and transcendental, and it has the natural power to know all things and to regulate and overcome everything by its mere presence" (Sve.Up. 6.8).

Section 113

References:

यदत्र वक्तव्यं तत्पुरस्तादेवोक्तम् । श्रुत्यवगाह्यमेवेदमतिगम्भीरं ब्रह्म न तर्कावगाह्यम् । न च यथैकस्य सामर्थ्यं दृष्टं तथान्यस्यापि सामर्थ्येन भवितव्यमिति नियमोऽस्तीति । प्रतिषिद्धसर्वविशेषस्यापि ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगः सम्भवतीति ।
एतदप्यविद्याकल्पितरूपभेदोपन्यासेनोक्तमेव ।

तथा च शास्त्रम् - 'अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः' (स्वे।उप्। ३।१९) इत्यकरणस्यपि ब्रह्मणः सर्वसामर्थ्ययोगं दर्शयति

BSBh. 2.1.31

All that can be said in reply to this has already been stated before. This extremely solemn Brahman is capable of being understood only through the Scriptures and never through reasoning (only!). There is no such rule that because one entity is observed to possess certain powers, any other entity must necessarily possess all these powers. That it is possible, that Brahman, with regard to which all special attributes are denied, may yet possibly possess all powers when it is borne in mind that it has already been stated that even though all specific attributes are denied in the case of Brahman. **Still when it is assumed that it has different forms or natures imagined through ignorance (Avidyā), it becomes possible that it (i.e. Brahman) can have a connection with all powers**. Even so teaches the Śāstra (Scriptures), viz., that unequipped with physical organs though Brahman is, it still is possessed of all powers, by the passage – "Though he has neither hands nor feet, he grasps and is capable of swift movement, he sees even

though he has no eyes and hears even though he has no ears to hear" (Sve.Up. 3.19).

Section 114

References:

तुशब्दः पक्षं व्यावर्तयति । यत्सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति ब्रह्म नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावं शारीरादधिकमन्यत्, तत् वयं जगतः स्रष्टृ ब्रूमः । न तस्मिन्हिताकरणादयो दोषाः प्रसज्यन्ते । न हि तस्य हितं किञ्चित्कर्तव्यमस्ति, अहितं वा परिहर्तव्यम्, नित्यमुक्तस्वभावत्वात् । न च तस्य ज्ञानप्रतिबन्धः शक्तिप्रतिबन्धो वा क्वचिदप्यस्ति,

सर्वज्ञत्वात्सर्वशक्तित्वाच्च । शारीरस्त्वनेवंविधः । तस्मिन्प्रसज्यन्ते हिताकरणादयो दोषाः न तु तं वयं जगतः स्रष्टारं ब्रूमः

BSBh. 2.1.22

The word 'But' rebuts the (opponent's) view. We maintain that Brahman, which is omniscient, and omnipotent, and which possesses a nature which is eternally pure and enlightened, and which is free and is greater than the Jīva-Self, and is different (from it), is the creator of the world. The faults of not doing what is beneficial etc. do not attach themselves to it. Possessing as it does the nature of being eternally free, It has no duties either to perform anything beneficial or not to perform anything

unbeneficial (to itself). Because of being omniscient and omnipotent there is also not the least let or hindrance either to its knowledge or power. The Jīva-Self on the other hand is unlike that and the faults of not doing what is beneficial etc. do of course attach to it. But we do not maintain that the Jīva-Self is the creator of the world.

नन्वभेदनिर्देशोऽपि दर्शितः - 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवंजातीयकः ।

कथं भेदाभेदौ विरुद्धौ सम्भवतः ? नैष दोषः,
महाकाशघटाकाशन्यायेनोभयसम्भवस्य तत्र तत्र प्रतिष्ठापितत्वात्

BSBh. 2.1.22

Objection: But there is a mention also of the non-distinction between the two, such as – "That thou art". How can distinction and non-distinction which are contrary to each other be both possible?

Reply: This no fault, because we have already established in several proper places, that according to the maxim of "The Ākāśa and the Ākāśa of the pot", both are possible.

अपि च यदा 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवंजातीयकेनाभेदनिर्देशेनाभेदः प्रतिबोधितो भवति । अपगतं भवति तदा जीवस्य संसारित्वं ब्रह्मणश्च स्रष्टृत्वम् । समस्तस्य मिथ्याज्ञानविजृम्भितस्य भेदव्यवहारस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानेन

बाधितत्वात् । तत्र कुत एव सृष्टिः कुतो वा हिताकरणादयो दोषाः । अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतकार्यकरणसङ्घातोपाध्यविवेककृता हि भ्रान्तिर्हिताकरणादिलक्षणः संसारः न तु परमार्थतोऽस्तीति असकृदवोचाम -

BSBh. 2.1.22

Besides when the non-distinction (between the two) comes to be realized, by means of such reference to non-distinction, as “That thou art”, then the nature of the transmigratory existence of the Jīva-Self, and the creative activity of Brahman, both vanish. On account of the removal of the entire set of transactions, depending upon the notion of distinction, which is but only a display of wrong knowledge, by true knowledge. Whence could then there be any creation (of the world) at all or any such faults of not doing that which is beneficial? We have said more than once, that this transmigratory existence characterized by the avoidance of what is beneficial etc., is nothing but a delusion. [Since this delusion is] caused by the failure to realize the limiting adjuncts, such as the aggregates of bodies and organs of sense, and names and forms brought about by ignorance, and it is not as if it exists in the truest (or real) sense.

अबाधिते तु भेदव्यवहारे 'सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः' इत्येवंजातीयकेन भेदनिर्देशेनावगम्यमानं ब्रह्मणोऽधिकत्वं हिताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिं निरुणद्धि

BSBh. 2.1.22

As long as the notion of distinction (between the Jīva-Self and Brahman) continues unobliterated, the notion of Brahman being different from (and more than) the Jīva-Self, as understood from the scriptural passage "He should be searched for and understood", precludes the possibility of the attachment to Brahman, of any such faults as the not doing of things beneficial etc. (to itself).

Section 115

References:

सापेक्षो हीश्वरो विषमां सृष्टिं निर्मिमीते । किमपेक्षत इति चेत् - धर्माधर्मावपेक्षत इति वदामः । अतः सृज्यमानप्राणिधर्माधर्मापेक्षा विषमा सृष्टिरिति नायमीश्वरस्यापराधः । ईश्वरस्तु पर्जन्यवद्द्रष्टव्यः - यथा हि पर्जन्यो व्रीहियवादिसृष्टौ साधारणं कारणं भवति । व्रीहियवादिवैषम्ये तु तत्तद्बीजगतान्येवासाधारणानि सामर्थ्यानि कारणानि भवन्ति । एवमीश्वरो देवमनुष्यादिसृष्टौ साधारणं कारणं भवति । देवमनुष्यादिवैषम्ये तु तत्तज्जीवगतान्येवासाधारणानि कर्माणि कारणानि भवन्ति

BSBh. 2.1.34

It is because the Lord just has such regard (for a person's merit or demerit) that he brings about such unequal creation.

What then, is his regard about?

We say that he has a regard for the merit or demerit of persons. Surely it is no fault of the Lord, that his bringing about of such unequal creation is due to the regard he has for the merit and demerit of the beings about to be created. The Lord should rather be **looked upon to be like 'rain'. Just as rain is the general cause which makes rice and barley grow, while the different potentialities inherent in their seeds**, are the cause of the disparity between such rice and barley, even so in the creation of Gods and men etc. the Lord is but the general common cause only, while for the inequality between Gods and men etc., they have their own different individual actions as the cause,

अनादौ तु संसारे । बीजाङ्कुरवद्धेतुहेतुमद्भावेन कर्मणः सर्गवैषम्यस्य च प्रवृत्तिर्न विरुध्यते

BSBh. 2.1.35

But transmigratory existence being beginningless, there need not be any objection for action and the variety of creation, to act alternately as cause and effect of each

other, like the seed and the sprout, and to have a tendency for creation having such disparity.

Section 116

References:

यथा लोके कस्यचिदाप्तैषणस्य राज्ञो राजामात्यस्य वा । व्यतिरिक्तं किञ्चित्प्रयोजनमनभिसन्धाय केवलं लीलारूपाः प्रवृत्तयः क्रीडाविहारेषु भवन्ति । यथा चोच्छ्वासप्रश्वासादयोऽनभिसन्धाय बाह्यं किञ्चित्प्रयोजनं स्वभावादेव सम्भवन्ति । एवमीश्वरस्याप्यनपेक्ष्य किञ्चित्प्रयोजनान्तरं स्वभावादेव केवलं लीलारूपा प्रवृत्तिर्भविष्यति

BSBh. 2.1.33

Just as in the ordinary world, in the case of a king who has attained all his desires or of his minister, their activities in sports and pastimes are merely of the nature of a sport and are indulged in without any particular aim in mind or just as the inspiration or expiration etc. (of a man) takes place naturally, without any extraneous purpose even so may the Lord also engage in such sportful activity without any purpose, and merely as the result of his nature.

यद्यप्यस्माकमियं जगद्बिम्बविरचना गुरुतरसंरम्भेवाभाति ।

तथापि परमेश्वरस्य लीलैव केवलेयम् । अपरिमितशक्तित्वात्

BSBh. 2.1.33

Though the creation of this world-sphere appears to us as a stupendous undertaking, yet to the Lord, it is but a mere pastime, because of his measureless power.

ततश्च एकस्य देवस्य सर्वाध्यक्षभूतचैतन्यमात्रस्य परमार्थतः सर्वभोगानभिसम्बन्धिनः अन्यस्य चेतनान्तरस्य अभावे भोक्तुः अन्यस्य अभावात् । किंनिमित्ता इयं सृष्टिः इत्यत्र प्रश्नप्रतिवचने अनुपपन्ने, 'को अद्धा वेद क इह प्रवोचत् । कुत आजाता कुत इयं विसृष्टिःऽ (ऋ। १० । १२९ । ६), (तै। ब्रा। २ । ८ । ९) इत्यादिमन्त्रवर्णेभ्यः

BGh. 9.10

Since it follows from this that there is no other conscious being part from the one Deity who is the witness of all as the absolute Consciousness, and who **in reality has no contact with any kind of enjoyment, therefore there is no other enjoyer**. Hence, in this context, the question, 'For what purpose is this creation?', and its answer are baseless in accordance with the Vedic text, 'Who know (It) truly, who can fully speak about this here? From

where has this come? From where this variegated creation is?'

यदि नाम लोके लीलास्वपि किञ्चित्सूक्ष्मं प्रयोजनमुत्प्रेक्ष्येत । तथापि नैवात्र किञ्चित्प्रयोजनमुत्प्रेक्षितुं शक्यते । आप्तकामश्रुतेः । नाप्यप्रवृत्तिरुन्मत्तप्रवृत्तिर्वा । सृष्टिश्रुतेः, सर्वज्ञश्रुतेश्च

BSBh. 2.1.33

May be, that in the case of the ordinary world, we may imagine perhaps some minute purpose even for sports, but here in the case of **the Lord, it is not possible to imagine any such purpose, because of the scriptural statement about His being one who has obtained all his desires**, nor can we say that the Lord has no such activity or that such activity is that of a person who is possessed of an evil spirit or of one who is insane, because of the Scriptural statement about creation and about his being Omniscient.

Section 117

References:

यस्मादस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि कारणे परिगृह्यमाणे ।

प्रदर्शितेन प्रकारेण सर्वे कारणधर्मा उपपद्यन्ते ।

‘सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति महामायं च ब्रह्म’ इति,

तस्मादनतिशङ्कनीयमिदमौपनिषदं दर्शनमिति

BSBh. 2.1.37

In as much as, when once this Brahman is accepted as the cause of this world, all qualities attributable to the cause, become reasonably sustainable in the manner indicated, viz. – that Brahman is omniscient, omnipotent and possesses the great power of Maya and that therefore one should not doubt the Upaniṣad doctrine over much.

न चेयं परमार्थविषया सृष्टिश्रुतिः
अविद्याकल्पितनामरूपव्यवहारगोचरत्वात्,

ब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनपरत्वाच्च - इत्येतदपि नैव विस्मर्तव्यम्

BSBh. 2.1.33

Nor should it ever be forgotten, that even this scriptural statement about creation (by the Lord) is not so in the truest (absolute) sense, But with reference to the perception of the transactions of names and forms being merely imagined through Nescience, and also because it purports to propound how Brahman is the Self (of everything).

Section 118

References:

यत्र यस्मिन् अविद्याकल्पिते कार्यकरणसङ्घातोपाधिजनिते विशेषात्मनि खिल्यभावे, हि यस्मात् , द्वैतमिव – परमार्थतोऽद्वैते ब्रह्मणि द्वैतमिव भिन्नमिव वस्त्वन्तरमात्मनः – उपलक्ष्यते

Br.Up. 2.4.14 Bh.

Because when, i.e. in the presence of the particular or individual aspect of the Self due to the limiting adjuncts of the body and organs conjured up by ignorance, there is duality, as it were, in Brahman, which really is one without a second, i.e. there appears to be something different from the Self.

तत् तत्र यस्माद्द्वैतमिव तस्मादेव इतरोऽसौ परमात्मनः खिल्यभूत आत्मा अपरमार्थः, चन्द्रादेरिव उदकचन्द्रादिप्रतिबिम्बः, इतरो घ्राता इतरेण घ्राणेन इतरं घ्रातव्यं जिघ्रति

Br.Up. 2.4.14 Bh.

Then, just because there is duality as it were, therefore one, he who smells, viz. the unreal individual aspect of the Supreme Self, comparable to the reflection of the moon etc. in water, smells something that can be smelt, through something else, viz. the nose.

विजानाति ; इयम् अविद्यावदवस्था

Br.Up. 2.4.14 Bh.

One knows something. This is the state of ignorance.

यत्र तु ब्रह्मविद्यया अविद्या नाशमुपगमिता तत्र आत्मव्यतिरेकेण अन्यस्याभावः । यत्र वै अस्य ब्रह्मविदः सर्वं नामरूपादि आत्मन्येव प्रविलापितम् आत्मैव संवृत्तम् – यत्र एवम् आत्मैवाभूत् , तत् तत्र केन करणेन कं घ्रातव्यं को जिघ्रेत् ? तथा पश्येत् ? विजानीयात्

Br.Up. 2.4.14 Bh.

But **when ignorance has been destroyed by the knowledge of Brahman, there is nothing but the Self.** When to the knower of Brahman everything such as name and form has been merged in the Self and has thus become the Self, then what object to be smelt should one smell, who should smell, and through what instrument? Similarly, what should one see and hear? (what should one know?)

एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः – नात्मा जीव उत्पद्यत इति । कस्मात् ? अश्रुतेः ; न ह्यस्योत्पत्तिप्रकरणे श्रवणमस्ति भूयःसु प्रदेशेषु । ननु क्वचिदश्रवणमन्यत्र श्रुतं न वारयतीत्युक्तम् ; सत्यमुक्तम् ; उत्पत्तिरेव त्वस्य न सम्भवतीति वदामः । कस्मात् ? नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः – चशब्दादजत्वादिभ्यश्च – नित्यत्वं ह्यस्य श्रुतिभ्योऽवगम्यते, तथा अजत्वम् अविकारित्वम् अविकृतस्यैव ब्रह्मणो जीवात्मनावस्थानं

ब्रह्मात्मना चेति ; न चैवंरूपस्योत्पत्तिरुपपद्यते । ताः काः श्रुतयः ? – ‘ न जीवो म्रियतेऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ११ । ३) ‘ स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २५) ‘ न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्ऽ (क। उ। १ । २ । १८) ‘ अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणःऽ (क। उ। १ । २ । १८) ‘ तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्ऽ (तै। उ। २ । ६ । १) ‘ अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ३ । २) ‘ स एष इह प्रविष्ट आ नखाग्रेभ्यःऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । ७) ‘ तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) ‘ अहं ब्रह्मास्मिऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) ‘ अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ५ । १९) इत्येवमाद्या नित्यत्ववादिन्यः सत्यः जीवस्योत्पत्तिं प्रतिबध्नन्ति

BSBh. 2.3.17

To this conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta) the reply we give is: – The Self i.e. the Jīva-Self is not subject to being created.

Whence is it so? Because there is no scriptural passage (about its creation). In very many places (in the scriptures) in the chapter on genesis there is no mention of it.

Objection: But it has been remarked (by me) that non-mention in a particular passage is unable to restrict a statement (to that effect) in other passages of scriptures.

Reply: Of course it is true that it is so said (by you), but what we say is, that its creation itself is not possible.

Whence is it so? Because according to them (i.e. the scriptural passages) the Self is eternal. And also because of the word ‘Ca’ (Also), and also because of the

characteristics of being ‘unborn’ etc. That the Self is eternal is understood from the scriptures, and it is also understood that it is not subject to being born, and that it is not an effect or modification, and that it is the unmodified Brahman itself. That subsists as the Jīva-Self and which has Brahman as its Self. That an entity of this nature i.e. form should be liable to being created, is not reasonably sustainable.

Opponent: What are those scriptural passages?

Reply: “The Jīva-Self does not die” (Chan.Up. 6.11.3); “This great unborn Self, which is undecaying, deathless, immortal, and fearless is itself Brahman” (Br.Up. 4.4.22); “This ancient one is unborn, eternal and everlasting” (Kath.Up. 1.2.18); “The wise one (i.e. the Self) is neither born nor does it die” (Kath.Up. 1.2.18); “Having brought it into being, it itself entered into it” (Tai.Up. 2.6.1); “I will now enter into them myself as the Jīva-Self and evolve names and forms” (Chan.Up. 6.3.2); “This Self permeated into it right down the extremity of the fingernails” (Br.Up. 2.4.7); “That thou art” (Chan.Up. 6.8.7); “I am Brahman” (Br.Up. 1.4.10); “This Self is Brahman, the experiencer of everything” (Br.Up. 2.5.19). These and such, other Scriptural passages, which speak about the Jīva-Self’s being eternal, being there, they obstruct the possibility of the creation of the Jīva-Self.

Section 119

References:

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन

Ma.Up.Ka 3.15 (Karika)

(The scriptural statements regarding) creation as illustrated by examples of earth, iron, sparks, etc., or otherwise, (only) serve the purpose of (ultimately) explaining the unity (of Jīva and Brahman). (Really speaking) multiplicity does not exist in any manner.

ननु यद्युत्पत्तेः प्रागजं सर्वमेकमेवाद्वितीयम् , तथापि उत्पत्तेरूर्ध्वं जातमिदं सर्वं जीवाश्च भिन्ना इति । मैवम् ,
अन्यार्थत्वादुत्पत्तिश्रुतीनाम् ।

पूर्वमपि परिहृत एवायं दोषः – स्वप्नवदात्ममायाविसर्जिताः सङ्घाताः, घटाकाशोत्पत्तिभेदादिवज्जीवानामुत्पत्तिभेदादिरिति । इत एव उत्पत्तिभेदादिश्रुतिभ्य आकृष्य इह
पुनरुत्पत्तिश्रुतीनामैदम्पर्यप्रतिपिपादयिषयोपन्यासः ।

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गादिदृष्टान्तोपन्यासैः सृष्टिः या च उदिता प्रकाशिता कल्पिता अन्यथान्यथा च, स सर्वः सृष्टिप्रकारो
जीवपरमात्मैकत्वबुद्ध्यवतारायोपायोऽस्माकम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.15 Bh.

Objection: Before creation all this might have been unborn, one and nondual; but after creation, all this evolved world and the embodied beings (Jivas) denote multiplicity.

Reply: No (maivam, not naivaṃ), it cannot be so. For, the scriptural passages dealing with creation have another meaning. This difficulty raised here has already been solved by the statements that the aggregates (entities) of body, etc., like dream objects, are produced through illusion of the subject (Atman) and that creation and the differences of the Jivas are like the creation and the differences of the Ghaṭākāśas, i.e., the bits of Ākāśa enclosed in different jars. Therefore, taking that very reason for granted, some Vedic texts dealing with creation are being adduced here, from amongst the **texts dealing with creation, difference, etc., with a view to showing that they are meant for establishing the oneness of the Self and the individual beings.** The (theory of) creation has been described in the scripture through the illustrations of earth, iron, sparks, etc., or otherwise; but all these modes of creation are meant for enlightening our intellect so that it may comprehend the identity of Jiva and Brahman.

आत्मा ह्याकाशवज्जीवैर्घटाकाशैरिवोदितः ।

घटादिवच्च सङ्घातैर्जातावेतन्निदर्शनम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.3 (Karika)

Ātman may be said to be similar to Ākāśa (ether) manifested in the forms of the Jīvas (embodied selves) which may be compared to the ether enclosed in pots. Again, as pots, etc., are said to be produced from the Ākāśa (ether), similarly (gross) bodies are said to be evolved from the Ātman. This is the illustration of the manifestation (from Brahman, if any).

अथवा घटाकाशैर्यथा आकाश उदितः उत्पन्नः, तथा परो जीवात्मभिरुत्पन्नः ; जीवात्मनां परस्मादात्मन उत्पत्तिर्या श्रूयते वेदान्तेषु, सा महाकाशाद्घटाकाशोत्पत्तिसमा, न परमार्थत इत्यभिप्रायः । तस्मादेवाकाशाद्घटादयः सङ्घाता यथा उत्पद्यन्ते, एवमाकाशस्थानीयात्परमात्मनः पृथिव्यादिभूतसङ्घाता आध्यात्मिकाश्च कार्यकरणलक्षणा रज्जुसर्पवद्विकल्पिता जायन्ते ; अत उच्यते – घटादिवच्च सङ्घातैरुदित इति । यदा मन्दबुद्धिप्रतिपिपादयिषया श्रुत्या आत्मनो जातिरुच्यते जीवादीनाम् , तदा जातावुपगम्यमानायाम् एतत् निदर्शनं दृष्टान्तः यथोदिताकाशवदित्यादिः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.3 Bh.

Or just as ether (that is infinite) has evolved as ether confined within jars, so too, has the supreme Self evolved as the individual souls. The drift is that the rise

of the individual souls from the supreme Self that is heard of in the Upanishads, is comparable to the ether confined within jars, which arose from the supreme ether, but it is not so in reality. Therefore, just as from (the infinite) ether is evolved the aggregate of jar etc., so too, from the supreme Self comparable to ether, evolves the aggregate of the elements such as the earth etc. as well as the bodies and senses of individuals, the entire process being a mere imagination like a snake on a rope. Hence it is said, 'like a jar etc." It is existing as the aggregate of bodies. When, with a view to enlightening those men of poor intellect, the birth of beings etc. from the Self is mentioned by the sruti, then birth, being accepted as a fact, is explained with this illustration, as memtioned (earlier) in such words as 'just as ether' etc.

Section 120

References:

भूततः परमार्थतः सृज्यमाने वस्तुनि, अभूततः मायया वा मायाविनेव सृज्यमाने वस्तुनि समा तुल्या सृष्टिश्रुतिः । ननु गौणमुख्ययोर्मुख्ये शब्दार्थप्रतिपत्तिर्युक्ता । न, अन्यथासृष्टेरप्रसिद्धत्वान्निष्प्रयोजनत्वाच्च

इत्यवोचाम । अविद्यासृष्टिविषयैव सर्वा गौणी मुख्या च सृष्टिः, न परमार्थतः ।

'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) इति श्रुतेः ।

तस्मात् श्रुत्या निश्चितं यत् एकमेवाद्वितीयमजममृतमिति, युक्तियुक्तं च युक्त्या च सम्पन्नम् , तदेवेत्यवोचाम पूर्वैर्ग्रन्थैः ; तदेव श्रुत्यर्थो भवति, नेतरत्कदाचिदपि क्वचिदपि

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.23 Bh.

The Scriptural text regarding creation is the same, whether the creation of things is taken in the real sense or as a mere illusion produced by the juggler.

Objection: If words admit of metaphorical and direct meanings, it is reasonable to understand the world according to their direct meaning.

Reply: We do not admit it. For, creation, in any sense other than illusion, is unknown to us, and further, no purpose is served by admitting (the act of) creation.

All creation, whether metaphorical or actual, refers to the apparent creation caused by ignorance but not to any creation from the standpoint of Reality. For the Sruti says, "Though existing both within and without, he (the Atman) is (really) unborn" (Mun.Up. 2.1.2). Therefore, that which has been settled by the sruti as "One without a second, unborn and immortal" is supported by

reasoning. This we have explained through the preceding verses. That alone can be the meaning of the sruti and it can never be anything else.

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गादिदृष्टान्तोपन्यासैः सृष्टिः या च उदिता प्रकाशिता कल्पिता अन्यथान्यथा च, स सर्वः सृष्टिप्रकारो जीवपरमात्मैकत्वबुद्ध्यवतारायोपायोऽस्माकम् । यथा प्राणसंवादे वागाद्यासुरपाप्मवेधाद्याख्यायिका कल्पिता प्राणवैशिष्ट्यबोधावताराय

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.15 Bh.

The (theory of) creation has been described in the scripture through the illustrations of earth, iron, sparks, etc., or otherwise; but all these modes of creation are meant for enlightening our intellect so that it may comprehend the identity of Jiva and Brahman. It is just like the story of the organs of speech (vāk), etc., being smitten with evil by the Asuras (demons) as described in the chapter on Prana (vital breath), where the real purpose of the Śruti is to demonstrate the special importance of Prana.

न, निष्प्रयोजनत्वाद्यथोक्तबुद्ध्यवतारप्रयोजनव्यतिरेकेण । न हयन्यप्रयोजनवत्त्वं संवादोत्पत्तिश्रुतीनां शक्यं कल्पयितुम् ।

तथात्वप्रत्तिपत्तये ध्यानार्थमिति चेत् । न, कलहोत्पत्तिप्रलयानां प्रतिपत्तेरनिष्टत्वात् । तस्मादुत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतय आत्मैकत्वबुद्ध्यवतारायैव, नान्यार्थाः कल्पयितुं युक्ताः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.15 Bh.

Reply: No. For, they (the illustrations of earth, iron, etc., as well as the stories of Prana) serve no other useful purpose than clearing our intellect as stated above. No one can imagine any other utility of the scriptural statements regarding creation and Prana.

Objection: We contend that these are for the purpose of meditation so that one may ultimately attain to that end.

Reply: No; for no one desires to attain his identity with the dispute (in the case of the Prana narrative), or with the creation or destruction (in the case of the scriptural statements regarding creation, etc.). Therefore, we have reasonably to conclude that the **scriptural statements regarding creation, etc., are for the purpose of helping the mind to realise the oneness of Atman, and for no other purpose** whatsoever.

Section 121

References:

न ह्ययं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः प्रतिपिपादयिषितः । न हि तत्प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित्पुरुषार्थो दृश्यते श्रूयते वा । न च कल्पयितुं शक्यते। उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यां तत्र तत्र ब्रह्मविषयैर्वाक्यैः साकमेकवाक्यताया गम्यमानत्वात्

BSBh. 1.4.14

It is not here intended to speak at length about the creation. We neither see nor find it mentioned by the scriptures that any particular consummation devoutly to be wished for by man (Puruṣārtha) is bound up with it, nor is it possible to imagine so, because it is understood from the introductory and concluding portions, that the details about creation are in complete conformity with passages in various places dealing with Brahman.

न च यथा ब्रह्मण आत्मैकत्वदर्शनं मोक्षसाधनम् , एवं जगदाकारपरिणामित्वदर्शनमपि स्वतन्त्रमेव कस्मैचित्फलायाभिप्रेयते, प्रमाणाभावात् ; कूटस्थब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविज्ञानादेव हि फलं दर्शयति शास्त्रम् – ‘ स एष नेति नेत्यात्माऽ इत्युपक्रम्य ‘ अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसिऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । २ । ४) इत्येवंजातीयकम् । तत्रैतत्सिद्धं भवति – ब्रह्मप्रकरणे सर्वधर्मविशेषरहितब्रह्मदर्शनादेव फलसिद्धौ सत्याम् , यत्तत्राफलं श्रूयते ब्रह्मणो जगदाकारपरिणामित्वादि,

तद्ब्रह्मदर्शनोपायत्वेनैव विनियुज्यते, फलवत्सन्निधावफलं तदङ्गमितिवत् ; न तु स्वतन्त्रं फलाय कल्प्यत इति

BSBh. 2.1.14

Nor is it, that just as the realization of the doctrine of Brahman being the only one Self leads to the fruit of liberation, the knowledge that it is capable of modification in the form of this world also leads to some other independent fruit, because there is no authority for it. It is by the realization of the unchangeable Brahman alone that the scriptures show that there is a fruit, because the scriptures after first stating that "This Self (which can only be expressed negatively as) 'not this', 'not this'" indicate by the passage "Oh Janaka, you have indeed reached fearlessness" (Br.Up. 4.2.4), that there is a fruit of that type (viz. liberation). So this much is established, that in the chapter dealing with Brahman, when it is stated that the desired result is obtained only by realizing that Brahman is devoid of any special attributes. And some other thing having no such fruit is also mentioned along with it – such as, that Brahman has the quality of modification in the form of the world. It should be employed only as a means of realizing Brahman. (In accordance with the maxim of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā) – viz. “Whenever something which is fruitless is mentioned in

proximity with something which has some fruit, the former should be understood as being subordinate to the latter, and also that it has no independent fruit of its own."

दर्शयति च सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थताम् -

'अन्नेन सोम्य शुङ्गेनापो मूलमन्विच्छाद्भिः सोम्य शुङ्गेन तेजो मूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुङ्गेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ' (छन्।उप्। ६।८।४) इति।

BSBh. 1.4.14

The Scriptures further do indicate how the account of the creation at full length has the purpose of making one understand Brahman from it. "Oh mild one, seek out from the sprout (i.e. root cause) in the form of the earth, the root-cause in the form of 'water', by the sprout (i.e. root-cause) in the form of water, seek out the root-cause in the form of Tejas, and by the sprout (i.e. root-cause) in the form of Tejas, seek out the root-cause in the form of Sat" (Chan.Up. 6.8.4).

Section 122

References:

कस्मात्पुनरुत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतीनां विशेषनिराकरणश्रुतिशेषत्वम् , न पुनरितरशेषत्वमितरासामिति, उच्यते –

विशेषनिराकरणश्रुतीनां निराकाङ्क्षार्थत्वात् ; न हि आत्मन एकत्वनित्यत्वशुद्धत्वाद्यवगतौ सत्यां भूयः काचिदाकाङ्क्षा उपजायते, पुरुषार्थसमाप्तिबुद्ध्युत्पत्तेः, 'तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः (ई। उ। ७) 'अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसि (बृ। उ। ४ । २ । ४) 'विद्वान्न बिभेति कुतश्चन । एत ह वाव न तपति । किमह साधु नाकरवम् । किमहं पापमकरवम् (तै। उ। २ । ९ । १) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः । तथैव च विदुषां तुष्ट्यनुभवादिदर्शनात् , विकारानृताभिसन्ध्यपवादाच्च – 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति इति ; अतो न विशेषनिराकरणश्रुतीनामन्यशेषत्वमवगन्तुं शक्यम् । नैवमुत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतीनां निराकाङ्क्षार्थप्रतिपादनसामर्थ्यमस्ति ; प्रत्यक्षं तु तासामन्यार्थत्वं समनुगम्यते

BSBh. 4.3.14

Objection: But, why again (should it be), that the scriptural statements about creation etc. should be in a subordinate position to those which aim at denying differences in Brahman, and why should not the latter be in a subordinate position to the former?

Reply: It is replied – Because scriptural statements which deny any special differences (in Brahman) have the purport of not leaving any further unsatisfied curiosity (Nirākaṅkṣatvāt). On **the realization of the Self as being the only one, eternal and pure entity, no further curiosity ever again arises, because of the generation of a complete conviction** (in a person), that the final aim

of man is thus achieved, by reason of such Scriptural passages as – "How can there be any confusion or sorrow, in the case of a person, who realizes the unity (of Brahman)" (Is.Up. 7), "Oh Janaka, thou hast attained fearlessness" (Br.Up. 4.2.4), "One who knows (the bliss of Brahman) is unafraid and is not tormented (by the doubt) as to whether he has performed a good action or whether he has performed a sinful action" (Tai.Up. 2.9.1). Similarly, because it is also observed that those who have realized Brahman experience contentment (of mind), and because the scriptures have also censured the notion of considering the unreal effect, as being real, thus – "He who sees things as different goes from death to death". Hence it is not possible to consider the scriptural statements which deny differences, to be in a subordinate position to the other scriptural statements. Scriptural statements about creation etc. (of the world) have no such power to propound a meaning which results in allaying any further curiosity, while it is directly understood that they have a different meaning.

नन्वनेकात्मकं ब्रह्म ; यथा वृक्षोऽनेकशाखः, एवमनेकशक्तिप्रवृत्तियुक्तं ब्रह्म ; अत एकत्वं नानात्वं चोभयमपि सत्यमेव – यथा वृक्ष इत्येकत्वं शाखा इति च नानात्वम् ; यथा च समुद्रात्मनैकत्वं फेनतरङ्गाद्यात्मना

नानात्वम् , यथा च मृदात्मनैकत्वं घटशरावाद्यात्मना नानात्वम् ; तत्रैकत्वांशेन ज्ञानान्मोक्षव्यवहारः सेत्स्यति ; नानात्वांशेन तु कर्मकाण्डाश्रयौ लौकिकवैदिकव्यवहारौ सेत्स्यत इति ; एवं च मृदादिदृष्टान्ता अनुरूपा भविष्यन्तीति । नैवं स्यात् – ‘ मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्ऽ इति प्रकृतिमात्रस्य दृष्टान्ते सत्यत्वावधारणात् , वाचारम्भणशब्देन च विकारजातस्यानृतत्वाभिधानात् , दार्ष्टान्तिकेऽपि ‘ ऐतदात्म्यमिद सर्वं तत्सत्यम्ऽ इति च परमकारणस्यैवैकस्य सत्यत्वावधारणात् , ‘ स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतोऽ इति च शारीरस्य ब्रह्मभावोपदेशात्

BSBh. 2.1.14

Objection: But Brahma is of more than one form and just as a tree has many branches, even so Brahma is equipped with various powers and propensities (for creating effects), so that, (its) oneness and manifoldness are both necessarily equally true, just as, for instance, a tree as a tree is one, but considered in its aspect as one consisting of branches it is manifold, or just as the sea as sea is one, yet considered in its aspect as foam, waves etc. it is manifold, or just as the earth is one only, but considered in its aspect as a jar or a trough, it is manifold. The circumstances being such, Brahma, considered in its aspect of being one only, may well accomplish the process of Final Release, and considered in its manifold aspect, may help the accomplishment of worldly transactions and Vedic observances appertaining

to the "Karmakhanda". It is only in this way that the illustrations of the earth etc. can be appropriate.
Reply: No, it could not be like that. By the passage "That it is but earth merely, is the truth" it is understood that in the illustration it is the material cause alone that is considered to be true, and by the words 'made current by speech' the whole aggregate of effects is spoken of as being unreal. In the case of that which is illustrated, also, by the passage "In all that, this has its Self, that is the truth", that one, the highest cause alone, is understood to be true, because in the passage "He is the Self, that thou art, Oh Shvetaketu" the instruction is, that the **embodied JivaSelf is, in essence, Brahman**.

तस्करदृष्टान्तेन चानृताभिसन्धस्य बन्धनं सत्याभिसन्धस्य च मोक्षं दर्शयन् एकत्वमेवैकं पारमार्थिकं दर्शयति, मिथ्याज्ञानविजृम्भितं च नानात्वम् । उभयसत्यतायां हि कथं व्यवहारगोचरोऽपि जन्तुरनृताभिसन्ध इत्युच्येत । ‘ मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यतिऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । १९) इति च भेददृष्टिमपवदन्नेतदेव दर्शयति

न चास्मिन्दर्शने ज्ञानान्मोक्ष इत्युपपद्यते, सम्यग्ज्ञानापनोद्यस्य कस्यचिन्मिथ्याज्ञानस्य संसारकारणत्वेनानभ्युपगमात् ; उभयसत्यतायां हि कथमेकत्वज्ञानेन नानात्वज्ञानमपनुद्यत इत्युच्यते

BSBh. 2.1.14

The Scriptures also show by the 'illustration of the thief', that one who banks on falsehood convicts himself i.e. becomes tied down (to phenomenal existence), and one who depends on truth, secures an acquittal i.e. attains liberation, and they also show further, that the oneness of Brahman is the only one and the highest truth (Chan.Up. 6.16) and that its (socalled) manifoldness is merely the display of wrong knowledge (ignorance). For, if both could be true, how could a person observed to be involved in phenomenal worldly existence be said (by the scriptures) to bank on a falsehood? The Scriptures indicate this very thing, by finding fault with the viewing of things as different, by the passage "He who sees differences in things meets with death after death" (Br.Up. 4.4.19).

The doctrine (of our opponent) does not recognize liberation as resulting from knowledge to be reasonably sustainable, because it does not hold (like the Vedanta doctrine) that wrong knowledge, which is capable of being removed by true knowledge, is the cause of all transmigratory existence. If both the unitary and the manifold aspects of Brahman were to be true, how ever would the knowledge that Brahman is one and one only, be able to eradicate the knowledge of its manifoldness?

Section 123

References:

विप्रतिषेधाच्च परपक्षाणामनपेक्षितत्वं स्थापितम् । तद्वत्स्वपक्षस्यापि विप्रतिषेधादेवानपेक्षितत्वमाशङ्क्येत - इत्यतः सर्ववेदान्तगतसृष्टिश्रुत्यर्थनिर्मलत्वाय परः प्रपञ्च आरभ्यते - तदर्थनिर्मलत्वे च फलं यथोक्ताशङ्कानिवृत्तिरेव

BSBh. 2.3.1

The irrelevance of other schools (such as Sāṅkhya etc.) has already been established, because of the contradictions involved (in their doctrines). Similarly the irrelevance of the Vedānta system also may be alleged on the same ground of contradictions, and hence this further detailed amplification is begun, in order to make the meaning of the scriptural statements about creation, clear, and the fruit (Phala) of making the meaning clear, is the removal of the doubts referred to (above).

एवंजातीयकस्य कारणस्वरूपनिरूपणपरस्य वाक्यजातस्य प्रतिवेदान्तमविगीतार्थत्वात् । कार्यविषयं तु विगानं दृश्यते - क्वचिदाकाशादिका सृष्टिः क्वचित्तेजआदिकेत्येवंजातीयकम् । न च कार्यविषयेण विगानेन कारणमपि ब्रह्म सर्ववेदान्तेष्वविगीतमधिगम्यमानमविवक्षितं भवितुमर्हतीति शक्यते वक्तुम् । अतिप्रसङ्गात् । समाधास्यति चाचार्यः कार्यविषयमपि

विगानम् ‘न वियदश्रुतेः’ (ब्रस्। २।३।१) इत्यारभ्य। भवेदपि कार्यस्य विगीतत्वमप्रतिपाद्यत्वात्

BSBh. 1.4.14

That there is no discrepancy about the creator, is so, also because, all such sets of scriptural passages which expound the nature of the cause, do not show (that they have) any discrepant significance. Discrepancy with regard to the things created is no doubt observable, inasmuch as sometimes it speaks of creation, in which the Ākāśa is created first, and sometimes, it speaks of creation, in which Tejas is created first. It is not therefore possible to be able to say, on the ground of this discrepancy as regards the order of creation, that the cause i.e. Brahman also, which is understood from the scriptural passages as not having any discrepancy, deserves to be something which is not intended to be spoken of, because, it would be indiscrete or imprudent i.e. it will have the most extra-ordinary implications (Atiprasaṅgāt). The Ācārya will, later on, refute the alleged discrepancy about the order of creation also, beginning with the Sūtra – “Ākāśa is not created (because) it is not so stated by the scriptures” (BrS. 2.3.1). Besides, discrepancy with regard to things created, may well be there because the scriptures do not purport to expound that.

सूत्रकारोऽपि परमार्थाभिप्रायेण ‘ तदनन्यत्वम्ऽ इत्याह ; व्यवहाराभिप्रायेण तु ‘ स्याल्लोकवत्ऽ इति महासमुद्रस्थानीयतां ब्रह्मणः कथयति, अप्रत्याख्यायैव कार्यप्रपञ्चं परिणामप्रक्रियां चाश्रयति सगुणेषूपासनेषूपयोक्ष्यत इति

BSBh. 2.1.14

The Sutrakara also speaks of the nondifference of cause and effects, in the real sense only, and so far as the phenomenal transactions are concerned, he has likened Brahman to the ocean, in the preceding Sutra thus"It may well be so, as observed in the ordinary world". **He (the Sutrakara) accepts and does not refute the view about Brahman being liable to modification, in so far as it can be made use of in meditations on Brahma in its qualified (Saguna) aspect.**

Section 124

References:

यस्मात् आत्मनो जायते आत्मन्येव लीयत आत्ममयं च स्थितिकाले । आत्मव्यतिरेकेणाग्रहणात् , आत्मैव सर्वम्

Br.Up. 2.4.6 Bh.

for everything arises from the Self, finds its dissolution in It, and is composed of It during existence. Inasmuch as

nothing could be perceived apart from the Self, everything is but the Self.

अपि च वैशेषिकास्तन्त्रार्थभूतान् षट्पदार्थान्
द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायाख्यान् अत्यन्तभिन्नान्
भिन्नलक्षणान् अभ्युपगच्छन्ति – यथा मनुष्योऽश्वः शश इति ;
तथात्वं चाभ्युपगम्य तद्विरुद्धं द्रव्याधीनत्वं शेषाणामभ्युपगच्छन्ति ;
तन्नोपपद्यते । कथम् ? यथा हि लोके
शशकुशपलाशप्रभृतीनामत्यन्तभिन्नानां सतां नेतरेतराधीनत्वं भवति, एवं
द्रव्यादीनामप्यत्यन्तभिन्नत्वात् , नैव द्रव्याधीनत्वं गुणादीनां
भवितुमर्हति ; अथ भवति द्रव्याधीनत्वं गुणादीनाम् , ततो द्रव्यभावे
भावाद्द्रव्याभावेऽभावाद्द्रव्यमेव संस्थानादिभेदादनेकशब्दप्रत्ययभाग्भवति
– यथा देवदत्त एक एव सन् अवस्थान्तरयोगादनेकशब्दप्रत्ययभाग्भवति,
तद्वत् ; तथा सति सांख्यसिद्धान्तप्रसङ्गः
स्वसिद्धान्तविरोधश्चापद्येयाताम् । नन्वग्नेरन्यस्यापि सतो
धूमस्याग्न्यधीनत्वं दृश्यते ; सत्यं दृश्यते ; भेदप्रतीतेस्तु
तत्राग्निधूमयोरन्यत्वं निश्चीयते ; इह तु – शुक्लः कम्बलः, रोहिणी
धेनुः, नीलमुत्पलम् – इति द्रव्यस्यैव तस्य तस्य तेन तेन विशेषणेन
प्रतीयमानत्वात् नैव द्रव्यगुणयोरग्निधूमयोरिव भेदप्रतीतिरस्ति ;
तस्माद्द्रव्यात्मकता गुणस्य । एतेन कर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायानां
द्रव्यात्मकता व्याख्याता

BSBh. 2.2.17

Besides the Vaiśeṣikas hold that there are six categories, propounded in their Śāstra, called –

‘Substance’ (Dravya), ‘quality’ (Guṇa), ‘action’ (Karma), ‘generality’ (Sāmānya), ‘particularity’ (Viśeṣa) and ‘inherence’ (Samavāya), which are absolutely different from each other and have absolutely different characteristics, like a man, a horse, or a hare (which are different from each other and have different characteristics), and while holding thus, they also hold, in a way quite contrary to it, that all the other five categories are completely dependent on the category ‘substance’ (because, substance is a sine qua non for their existence). This of course is not reasonably sustainable. How is that? Just as in the ordinary world, a hare, grass or a tree which are absolutely different from each other are not mutually interdependent, even so, the categories such as ‘substance’ etc. being absolutely different from each other, categories such as ‘quality’ etc. do not deserve to be dependent on the category ‘substance’, inasmuch as they [the other five categories] would then exist only when a ‘substance’ exists, and would not exist when a substance does not exist, and it would then come to this, that it is the ‘substance’ only that comes to have these several terms applied to it, and becomes the object of knowledge, according to the different forms and conditions in which it happens to be.

Just as, Devadatta, one only as he is, becomes the object of different terms and perceptions according to the particular different conditions in which he happens to be, even so it is, in this case.

Objection: But even though 'fire' is a different entity (than smoke), 'smoke' is seen to be dependent upon 'fire'.

Reply: Yes, it certainly is seen to be so, but it is precisely because of the perception of their being different, that it is concluded that fire and smoke are different (entities). Here, however, in the case of a substance such as a white blanket or a dun cow, or a blue lotus, It is the substance itself, which, because of a particular qualification, is perceived to have its own particular quality, and not that a substance and its quality are perceived to be entities different from each other, like fire and smoke. Therefore, quality has substance as its self. It thus happens to be explained (i.e. by what is said about quality), that, the remaining five other categories viz. action (Karma) etc., have substance as their selfs (because they are not perceived to be different from substances).

Section 125

References:

यत्स्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणाग्रहणं यस्य, तस्य तदात्मत्वमेव लोके दृष्टम्

Br.Up. 2.4.7 Bh.

As our common experience shows, that apart from which a thing cannot be known, is the essence of that thing.

सर्वत्र द्वे बुद्धी सर्वैरुपलभ्येते समानाधिकरणे न नीलोत्पलवत् , सन् घटः, सन् पटः, सन् हस्ती इति । एवं सर्वत्र तयोर्बुद्ध्योः घटादिबुद्धिः व्यभिचरति । तथा च दर्शितम् । न तु सद्बुद्धिः । तस्मात् घटादिबुद्धिविषयः असन् , व्यभिचारात् ; न तु सद्बुद्धिविषयः, अव्यभिचारात्

BGh. 2.16

Now, in all our experience, twofold consciousness arises with reference to one and the same substratum (samanadhikarana), as, 'a cloth existent,' 'a pot existent,' 'an elephant existent' not as in the expression 'a blue lotus' and so on everywhere. Of the two, the consciousness of pot, etc., is temporary as was already pointed out, but not the consciousness of existence. Thus, the object corresponding to our consciousness of pot, etc., is unreal, because the consciousness is temporary; but what corresponds to our consciousness of

existence is not unreal, because the consciousness is unfailing.

ब्रह्मणोऽपि तर्हि सत्तालक्षणः स्वभाव आकाशादिष्वनुवर्तमानो दृश्यते

BSBh. 2.1.6

(The Vedāntin would retort) that Brahman's nature of having the characteristic of existence as such (sattā-lakṣaṇaḥ sva-bhāvaḥ) at least appears to continue to inhere in Ākāśa etc.

ननु वैशेषिकपक्षेऽपि सत्सामानाधिकरण्यं सर्वस्योपपद्यते, द्रव्यगुणादिषु सच्छब्दबुद्ध्यनुवृत्तेः – सद्द्रव्यं सन्गुणः सन्कर्मेत्यादिदर्शनात् ।

सत्यमेवं स्यादिदानीम् । प्रागुत्पत्तेस्तु नैवेदं कार्यं सदेवासीदित्यभ्युपगम्यते वैशेषिकैः, प्रागुत्पत्तेः कार्यस्यासत्त्वाभ्युपगमात् । न च एकमेव सदद्वितीयं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिच्छन्ति । तस्माद्वैशेषिकपरिकल्पितात्सतः अन्यत्कारणमिदं सदुच्यते मृदादिदृष्टान्तेभ्यः

Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.

Objection: Does is not also become established from the standpoint of the Vaisesikas that, all things remain associated with Existence, since the word 'Existence' and its idea remain associated with substances, qualities, etc. as is noticed in such usages as, 'The thing exists', 'The

quality exists', 'The quality exists', 'The action exists', etc.?

Reply: It is true that it can be so now. But it is not admitted by the Vaisesikas that, before (its) creation this product surely was existence alone. For, according to them a product has no existence before (its) creation. Nor do they admit that before creation there was only one Existence without a second. So this cause which is spoken of a Existence, through the illustrations of earth etc. is different from the existence imagined by the Vaisesikas.

न हि प्रागुत्पत्तेः नामवद्रूपवद्वा इदमिति ग्रहीतुं शक्यं वस्तु सुषुप्तकाले इव । यथा सुषुप्तादुत्थितः सत्त्वमात्रमवगच्छति सुषुप्ते सन्मात्रमेव केवलं वस्त्विति, तथा प्रागुत्पत्तेरित्यभिप्रायः

Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.

For, as is deep sleep, so also before creation it was not possible to grasp this as possessed of name of form. As someone, after rising from deep sleep, realizes that is deep sleep the thing that existed was mere existence, i.e. he realizes existence alone, similar was the case before creation. This is the meaning.

कथं पुनः इदानीम् इदं सर्वमात्मैवेति ग्रहीतुं शक्यते ?
चिन्मात्रानुगमात्सर्वत्र चित्स्वरूपतैवेति गम्यते ; तत्र दृष्टान्त उच्यते – यत्स्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणाग्रहणं यस्य, तस्य तदात्मत्वमेव लोके दृष्टम् ; स

यथा – स इति दृष्टान्तः ; लोके यथा दुन्दुभेः भेर्यादेः, हन्यमानस्य ताड्यमानस्य दण्डादिना, न, बाह्यान् शब्दान् बहिर्भूतान् शब्दविशेषान् दुन्दुभिशब्दसामान्यान्निष्कृष्टान् दुन्दुभिशब्दविशेषान् , न शक्नुयात् ग्रहणाय ग्रहीतुम् ; दुन्दुभेस्तु ग्रहणेन, दुन्दुभिशब्दसामान्यविशेषत्वेन, दुन्दुभिशब्दा एते इति, शब्दविशेषा गृहीता भवन्ति, दुन्दुभिशब्दसामान्यव्यतिरेकेणाभावात् तेषाम् ; दुन्दुभ्याघातस्य वा, दुन्दुभेराहननम् आघातः – दुन्दुभ्याघातविशिष्टस्य शब्दसामान्यस्य ग्रहणेन तद्गता विशेषा गृहीता भवन्ति, न तु त एव निर्भिद्य ग्रहीतुं शक्यन्ते, विशेषरूपेणाभावात् तेषाम् – तथा प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण स्वप्नजागरितयोः न कश्चिद्वस्तुविशेषो गृह्यते ; तस्मात् प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण अभावो युक्तस्तेषाम्

Br.Up. 2.4.7 Bh.

How is it then possible to understand now that all this is but the Self? **Since pure Intelligence (i.e., Consciousness) inheres in everything, all is known to be of the nature of Intelligence (Consciousness).** An illustration is being cited. As our common experience shows, that apart from which a thing cannot be known, is the essence of that thing. When a drum or the like is beaten with a stick, one is not able to distinguish the external notes of the drum. But on knowing the drum, by drawing distinction between the general and the particular notes of the drum in such a way as, 'These are the (various) notes of the drum' the particular notes become known, for they have no existence apart from the general note. Or on knowing the general sound coming out from

the drum while beating, the particular notes which they contain become known. But they cannot be perceived as distinct notes, for they have no independent existence. Similarly, **nothing particular is grasped in the waking and dream states apart from pure Intelligence. Therefore, their non-existence apart from pure intelligence is logical.**

अनेकदृष्टान्तोपादानम् इह सामान्यबहुत्वख्यापनार्थम् । अनेके हि विलक्षणाः चेतनाचेतनरूपाः सामान्यविशेषाः । तेषां पारम्पर्यगत्या यथा एकस्मिन् महासामान्ये अन्तर्भावः प्रज्ञानघने, कथं नाम प्रदर्शयितव्य इति ; दुन्दुभिशङ्खवीणाशब्दसामान्यविशेषाणां यथा शब्दत्वेऽन्तर्भावः, एवं स्थितिकाले तावत् सामान्यविशेषाव्यतिरेकात् ब्रह्मैकत्वं शक्यमवगन्तुम्

Br.Up. 2.4.9 Bh.

The citation of many examples here is for indicating varieties of genus; for there are many distinct kinds of genus, sentient and insentient. It is to show how through a series of intermediate steps they are included in a supreme genus, Pure Intelligence, that so many examples are given. Just as a drum, a conch and a Vīṇā have distinct general and particular notes of their own, which are included in sound in general, so during the continuance of the universe we may know all things to be unified in Brahman, because the varieties of genus and particulars are not different from It.

Section 126

References:

न च सल्लक्षणमेव ब्रह्म न बोधलक्षणम् - इति शक्यं वक्तुम् । 'विज्ञानघन एव' इत्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्य-प्रसङ्गात् । कथं वा निरस्तचैतन्यं ब्रह्म चेतनस्य जीवस्यात्मत्वेनोपदिश्येत । नापि बोधलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म न सल्लक्षणम् - इति शक्यं वक्तुम् । 'अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः' (कथु।२।३।१३) इत्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्य-प्रसङ्गा । कथं वा निरस्तसत्ताको बोधोऽभ्युपगम्येत ।

नाप्युभयलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म - इति शक्यं वक्तुम् । पूर्वाभ्युपगमविरोध-प्रसङ्गात् । सत्ता-व्यावृत्तेन च बोधेन बोध-व्यावृत्तया च सत्तया उपेतं ब्रह्म प्रतिजानानस्य । तदेव पूर्वाधिकरण-प्रतिषिद्धं सप्रपञ्चत्वं प्रसज्येत ।

श्रुतत्वाददोष इति चेत् । न, एकस्य अनेकस्वभावत्वानुपपत्तेः । अथ सत्तैव बोधः, बोध एव च सत्ता, नानयोः परस्पर-व्यावृत्तिरस्तीति यद्युच्येत । तथापि किं सल्लक्षणं ब्रह्म, उत बोधलक्षणम्, उतोभयलक्षणम् - इत्ययं विकल्पो निरालम्बन एव स्यात्

BSBh. 3.2.21

It is not possible to say that Brahman has only the characteristic of 'Sat' (Being) and not the characteristic of Knowledge i.e. Sentiency, as there would result the predicament of the scriptural passage about its being a mass of Knowledge i.e. Sentiency (Vijñāna-ghana) being rendered purposeless. How can Brahman devoid of any Knowledge i.e., sentiency be ever taught as being the Self of the sentient Jīva-Self? Nor can it be said that

Brahman has the characteristic of Knowledge i.e. Sentiency only and not of 'Sat' (Being). As there would result the predicament of the scriptural passage "It (i.e. Brahman) should be realized as the one that exists" (Kath.Up. 2.3.13) being rendered purposeless. Besides how ever can mere Knowledge i.e., Sentiency be conceived as apart from existence? Nor is it possible to say that the latter Adhikaraṇa is meant to establish that Brahman has both the characteristics, as that would contradict what has been already determined earlier.
In the case of one who understands Brahman to be Knowledge i.e. sentiency only, to the exclusion of 'Being' (Sat), or to be 'Being' (Sat) only, to the exclusion of Knowledge i.e. sentiency, there would result the predicament of having to understand Brahman as admitting of differences i.e. having a variety of worldly manifestations, which exactly was disproved by the earlier Adhikaraṇa.
Opponent: that there could not be such a fault because of scriptural authority.
Reply: No, because it would not be reasonably sustainable that one entity can ever have more than one nature. If it be said that 'Being' (Sat) is the same as Knowledge i.e. sentiency (Bodha) and Knowledge i.e. sentiency is the same as 'Being' (Sat) and that there could be no mutual exclusion of each from the other,

Then any doubt, as to whether Brahman has the characteristic of 'Being' (Sat) or Knowledge i.e. Sentiency (Bodha), or the characteristics of both Being (Sat) and Knowledge i.e. Sentiency (Bodha), would necessarily be without any foundation or support
(i.e., it could not be possible for the opponent of Vedānta to imagine any objection and to establish any conclusion by refuting it, and thus no separate Adhikaraṇa would be necessary).

सदेव सदिति अस्तितामात्रं वस्तु सूक्ष्मं निर्विशेषं सर्वगतमेकं निरञ्जनं निरवयवं विज्ञानम् , यदवगम्यते सर्ववेदान्तेभ्यः
Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.
Sat, Existence alone: The word Sat means mere Existence, a thing that is subtle, without distinction, all pervasive, one, taintless, partless, consciousness, which is known from all the Upanisads.

Section 127

References:

आनन्द इति सुखसामान्यम् आत्मा प्रियादीनां सुखावयवानाम् , तेष्वनुस्यूतत्वात् ।

आनन्द इति परं ब्रह्म । तद्धि शुभकर्मणा प्रत्युपस्थाप्यमाने पुत्रमित्रादिविषयविशेषोपाधौ अन्तःकरणवृत्तिविशेषे तमसा अप्रच्छाद्यमाने

प्रसन्ने अभिव्यज्यते । तद्विषयसुखमिति प्रसिद्धं लोके । तद्वृत्तिविशेषप्रत्युपस्थापकस्य कर्मणोऽनवस्थितत्वात् सुखस्य क्षणिकत्वम् ।

तद्यदन्तःकरणं तपसा तमोघ्नेन विद्यया ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया च निर्मलत्वमापद्यते यावत् , तावत् विविक्ते प्रसन्ने अन्तःकरणे आनन्दविशेष उत्कृष्यते विपुलीभवति

Tai.Up. 2.5.1 Bh.

Bliss, pleasure in general, is the soul (trunk) of the different limbs, (i.e. expressions) of happiness in the form of joy etc., for this ananda, (i.e. common Bliss) permeates them all. Ananda (Bliss) is supreme Brahman, for it is Brahman which manifests Itself in the various mental modifications, when such limiting adjuncts as the particular objects like a son, a friend, etc. are presented by the (past) good deeds and the mind, freed from tamas (gloom, darkness, etc.), becomes placid. And this is well known in the world as objective happiness. **This happiness is momentary, since the result of past deeds that brings about those particular modifications of the mind is unstable**. That being so, in proportion as that mind becomes purified through meditation, continence, and faith, so much do particular joys attain excellence and gain in volume in that calm and free mind.

तस्य अकामहतत्वप्रकर्षतश्चोपलभ्यमानः श्रोत्रियप्रत्यक्षो ब्रह्मण आनन्दः यस्य परमानन्दस्य मात्रा एकदेशः, 'एतस्यैवानन्दस्यान्यानि भूतानि मात्रामुपजीवन्ति' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ३२) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् । स एष आनन्दः यस्य मात्रा समुद्राम्भस इव विप्रुषः प्रविभक्ताः यत्रैकतां गताः स एष परमानन्दः स्वाभाविकः, अद्वैतात् ; आनन्दानन्दिनोश्च अविभागोऽत्र तदेतन्मीमांसाफलमुपसंह्रियते

Tai.Up. 2.8.1 Bh.

The bliss of Brahma, experienced on the perfection of desirelessness and also open to the direct vision of one who follows the Vedas, is a particle or bit of the supreme Bliss, in accordance with the Vedic text, 'On a particle of this very Bliss other beings live' (Br.Up. 4.3.32). This bliss (of Brahma and others) is a particle of that Supreme Bliss that is natural, from which it has separated like spray from the sea and into which it merges again. In It (the supreme Bliss) there is no split of the joy and the enjoyer, since It is nondual. The result of this evaluation is being concluded here.

Section 128

References:

तस्मात् 'विज्ञानमानन्दम्ऽ इति स्वरूपान्वाख्यानपरैव श्रुतिः, नात्मानन्दसंवेद्यत्वार्था

Br.Up. 3.9.28.7 Bh.

Therefore, the sruti, **'Knowledge, Bliss' etc. should be interpreted as indicating the true nature of the Self, and not as expressing the experience of the bliss of the Self.**

यो वै भूमा महत् निरतिशयं बहिविति पर्यायाः, तत्सुखम् । ततोऽर्वाक्सातिशयत्वादल्पम् । अतस्तस्मिन्नल्पे सुखं नास्ति, अल्पस्याधिकतृष्णाहेतुत्वात्

Chand.Up. 7.23.1 Bh.

That which is infinite, i.e. that which is possessed of the synonyms such as 'vast', 'unsurpassed' and 'abundant' is happiness. Anything below it, being limited, is finite. Hence there is no happiness in the finite, for the finite causes the desire for more.

अथ अन्यदर्शनविशेषप्रतिषेधेन आत्मानं पश्यतीत्युच्यते, तदैकस्मिन्नेव क्रियाकारकफलभेदोऽभ्युपगतो भवेत् । यद्येवं को दोषः स्यात् ? नन्वयमेव दोषः । संसारानिवृत्तिः । क्रियाकारकफलभेदो हि संसार इति

Chand. 7.24.1 Bh.

But, by the denial of the perception of something else, if it be held that one sees the Self, then it goes to admit that in the same entity there is the difference such as action, doer, and result.

(Disciple): Even if it be so, what is the harm?

(Teacher): Then Samsara (transmigratory existence) will never cease. This itself is the harm, for the differences of action, doer, and result constitute Samsara.

Section 129

References:

बाह्यानन्दसाधनरहिता अपि अनीहा निरेषणा ब्राह्मणा बाह्यरसलाभादिव सानन्दा दृश्यन्ते विद्वांसः ; नूनं ब्रह्मैव रसस्तेषाम् । तस्मादस्ति तत्तेषामानन्दकारणं रसवद्ब्रह्म

Tai.Up. 2.7.1 Bh.

Inasmuch as those Brahmanas who have realized Brahman are seen to be as happy as one is from obtaining an external source of joy though, in fact, they do not take help of any external means of happiness, make no effort, and cherish no desire, it follows, as a matter of course, that Brahman is, indeed, the source of their joy. Hence there does exist that Brahman which is full of joy and is the spring of their happiness.

मनसो विषयविषय्याकारस्पन्दनायासदुःखाभावात् आनन्दमयः आनन्दप्रायः ; नानन्द एव, अनात्यन्तिकत्वात् । यथा लोके निरायासः स्थितः सुख्यानन्दभुगुच्यते ।

अत्यन्तानायासरूपा हीयं स्थितिरनेनात्मनानुभूयत इत्यानन्दभुक् , 'एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ३२) इति श्रुतेः

Ma.Up. 5. Bh.

(At the time of deep sleep) the mind is free from the miseries of the efforts made on account of the states of the mind being involved in the relationship of subject and object: therefore, it is called the Ānandamaya, that is, endowed with an abundance of bliss. But this is not Bliss Itself; because it is not Bliss Infinite. As in common (experience) parlance, one, free from efforts, is called happy and enjoyer of bliss. As the Prajna enjoys this state of deep sleep, which is entirely free from all efforts, therefore it is called the 'Ānandabhuk' (the experiencer of bliss). The Śruti also says, "This is its highest bliss." (Br.Up. 4.3.32).

यानि अन्यानि विषयेन्द्रियसम्बन्धजनितानि आनन्दजातानि, तान्यपेक्ष्य एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः, नित्यत्वात् ; 'यो वै भूमा तत्सुखम्ऽ (छा। उ। ७ । २३ । १) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् । यत्र अन्यत्पश्यति अन्यद्विजानाति, तत् अल्पं मर्त्यम् अमुख्यं सुखम् ; इदं तु तद्विपरीतम् । अत एव

एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः । एतस्यैव आनन्दस्य मात्रां कलाम् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितां विषयेन्द्रियसम्बन्धकालविभाव्याम् अन्यानि भूतानि उपजीवन्ति । कानि तानि ?

तत एव आनन्दात् अविद्यया प्रविभज्यमानस्वरूपाणि, अन्यत्वेन तानि ब्रह्मणः परिकल्प्यमानानि अन्यानि सन्ति उपजीवन्ति भूतानि, विषयेन्द्रियसम्पर्कद्वारेण विभाव्यमानाम्

Br.Up. 4.3.32 Bh.

in comparison with the other joys that are due to the contact of the organs with their objects, since it is eternal; for another Śruti says, 'That which is infinite is bliss' (Ch.Up. 7.23.1). 'That in which one sees something. . . . knows something, is puny,' mortal, secondary joy. But this is the opposite of that hence 'this is its supreme bliss.' On a particle of this very bliss, put forward by ignorance, and perceived only during the contact of the organs with their objects, other beings live. Who are they? Those that have been separated from that bliss by ignorance and are considered different from Brahman. Being thus different, they subsist on a fraction of that bliss which is perceived through the contact of the organs with their objects.

यदपि तस्यामवस्थायां सुखमुक्तम् । तदप्यात्मन एव सुखरूपत्वविवक्षयोक्तम्

BSBh. 1.3.9

Again, this supreme bliss which is spoken of as existing in that condition is also similarly mentioned with a desire to intimate the blissful nature of the Highest Self alone

Section 130

No References

Section 131

References:

क्षेत्रज्ञो हि कर्तृत्वेन भोक्तृत्वेन च प्रतिशरीरं बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिसम्बद्धः । लोकत एव प्रसिद्धः, नासौ श्रुत्या तात्पर्येण विवक्ष्यते । ईश्वरस्तु लोकतोऽप्रसिद्धत्वाच्छ्रुत्या तात्पर्येण विवक्ष्यत इति

BSBh. 1.3.7

The Jīva-Self as an agent and an experiencer, and as connected with individual bodies by limiting adjuncts such as intelligence etc., is well-known in ordinary life, and is not desired to be spoken of as such by the scriptures. The Lord as such, however, not being so known in

ordinary life, is intended to be spoken of by the scriptures.

नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावे कूटस्थनित्ये एकस्मिन्नसङ्गे परमात्मनि तद्विपरीतं जैवं रूपं व्योम्नीव तलमलादि परिकल्पितम् । तत् आत्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनपरैर्वाक्यैर्न्यायोपेतैर्द्वैतवादप्रतिषेधैश्चापनेष्यामीति - परमात्मनो जीवादन्यत्वं द्रढयति - जीवस्य तु न परस्मादन्यत्वं प्रतिपिपादयिषति - किं त्वनुवदत्येवाविद्याकल्पितं लोकप्रसिद्धं जीवभेदम्

BSBh. 1.3.19

Just as it is imagined, that the Ākāśa has concavity and that it is dusty, similarly it is imagined, that the Highest Self, which has as its nature, eternal purity, knowledge, and freedom (from worldly existence) and which is eternally immoveable and uncontaminated, is of the opposite nature, viz. that of the Jīva-Self. And it is with a view to remove that misconception, by passages which establish the unity of Self, and which conform to reasoning and which reject the opinion of duality, That the Sūtrakāra emphasizes the distinction as between the Jīva-Self and the Highest Lord. The Sūtrakāra does not desire to assert that the Jīva-Self is different from the Highest Lord, but only refers to the popular notion about the **Jīva-Self as imagined through ignorance.**

Section 132

References:

जीवात्मनोरनन्यत्वमभेदेन प्रशस्यते ।

नानात्वं निन्द्यते यच्च तदेवं हि समञ्जसम्

Ma.Up.Ka 3.13 (Karika)

As the identity of Jīva and Ātman, through their nondual character, is praised and multiplicity is condemned (in the scriptures), therefore, that (nonduality) alone is rational and correct.

यद्युक्तितः श्रुतितश्च निर्धारितं जीवस्य परस्य चात्मनोऽनन्यत्वम् अभेदेन प्रशस्यते स्तूयते शास्त्रेण व्यासादिभिश्च, यच्च सर्वप्राणिसाधारणं स्वाभाविकं शास्त्रबहिर्मुखैः कुतार्किकैर्विरचितं नानात्वदर्शनं निन्द्यते, 'न तु तद्द्वितीयमस्ति' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । २३) 'द्वितीयाद्वै भयं भवति' (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । २) 'उदरमन्तरं कुरुते, अथ तस्य भयं भवति' (तै। उ। २ । ७ । १) 'इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा' (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । ६) 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति' (क। उ। २ । १ । १०) इत्येवमादिवाक्यैरन्यैश्च ब्रह्मविद्भिः यच्चैतत् , तदेवं हि समञ्जसम् ऋज्ववबोधं न्याय्यमित्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.13 Bh.

Since the nondifference of the individual soul and the supreme Self, determined through reasoning and the

srutis, is extolled by the scriptures and by Vyasa and others on the basis of their identity, and since the perception of diversity which is common and natural to all creatures and which is advocated by the logicians of disrepute who have rejected the scriptures, is denounced by the knowers of Brahman as well as by such teachings as, “(Then) there is not that second entity” (Br.Up. 4.3.23), “Fear arises indeed from a second entity” (Br.Up. 1.4.2), “When he makes the slightest deviation from it, he becomes possessed of fear’ (Tai.Up. 2.7.1), “All this is indeed the Self" (Br.Up. 2.4.6), and “Whoso here sees as though different, passes from death to death” (Katha. Upa. 2.1.10), all what is thus said is well comprehended, meaning it becomes consistent with logic from this viewpoint alone.

॥२६॥आचार्यो ब्रूयात् -- नैवं सोम्य प्रतिपत्तुमर्हसि, प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद्भेदप्रतिपत्तेः। कथं प्रदिषिद्धा भेदप्रतिपत्तिरित्यत आह -- अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद ब्रह्म तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनो ब्रह्म वेद मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति इत्येवमाद्याः।

॥२७॥एता एव श्रुतयो भेदप्रतिपत्तेः संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति।

॥२८॥अभेदप्रतिपत्तेश्च मोक्षं दर्शयन्ति सहस्रशः। स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि इति परमात्मभावं विधाय आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद इत्युक्त्वा तस्य तावदेव चिरम् इति मोक्षं दर्शयन्त्यभेदविज्ञानादेव। सत्याभिसंधस्यातस्करस्येव

दाहाद्यभावदृष्टान्तेन संसाराभावं दर्शयन्ति। भेददर्शनादसत्याभिसंधस्य संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति तस्करस्येव दाहादिदृष्टान्तेन।

UPS Prose 26-28

[then] the teacher should reply: “My dear, you should not hold such a view since it is prohibited to understand that [Atman] is different [from Brahman].”
[The pupil may say:] “How is it prohibited to understand that [Atman] is different [from Brahman]?”
Then the teacher replies: “‘So whoever worships another divinity [than his Atman], Of thinking that He is one and I another, he does not know’ (Br.Up. 1.4.10)
"Brahmanhood has deserted him who knows Brahmanhood as different from Atman’ (Br. Up. 2.4.6);
‘He who thinks he sees manifoldness in this world attains death after death’ (Br.Up. 4.4.19). “These Sruti passages indeed reveal that transmigratory existence results from the understanding that [Atman] is different [from Brahman]. “And thousands [of Sruti passages] reveal that liberation results from the realization of the identity [of Atman and Brahman]. [For example, through the statement,] ‘That is Atman, Thou art That’ (Chand.Up. 6. 8,7, etc.), [the Srutis] establish that [Atman] is the highest Atman (= Brahman). Then [they] state, ‘One who has a teacher knows’ (Chand. Up. 6.14.2), and [they] show liberation with the words,

‘He is delayed only until [he is freed from bondage of ignorance; then he will arrive at his final goal]’ (Chand. Up. 6.14.2). With the simile about the [man] who was not a thief and [therefore] not burned [in the ordeal of the heated axe, the Srutis] teach that he who covers himself with truth does not undergo transmigratory existence since he knows that [Atman] is identical [with Brahman]; [on the other hand], with the simile about the [man] who was a thief and was [therefore] burned, [the Srutis] teach that he who covers himself with the untruth undergoes transmigratory existence since [he holds] the view that [Atman] is different [from Brahman].

प्रतिपाद्यं तु शास्त्रार्थमात्मैकत्वमेव दर्शयति - ‘शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्’ (ब्रस्।१।१।३०) इत्यादिना

BSBh. 1.3.19

Is indicated (by the Sūtrakāra) by the Sūtra “The instruction (by Indra to Pratardana) is in conformity with the view of the Śāstra, as was in the case of Vāmadeva” (BrS.1.1.30) etc.

ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीत्तदात्मानमेवावेत् । अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति । तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्तथर्षीणां तथा मनुष्याणां तद्धैतत्पश्यनृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति । तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न देवाश्चनाभूत्या ईशते । आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति अथ योऽन्यां

देवतामुपास्तेऽन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद यथा पशुरेवं स देवानाम् । यथा ह वै बहवः पशवो मनुष्यं भुञ्ज्युरेवमेकैकः पुरुषो देवान्भुनक्त्येकस्मिन्नेव पशावादीयमानेऽप्रियं भवति किमु बहुषु तस्मादेषां तन्न प्रियं यदेतन्मनुष्या विद्युः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 (sruti)

This (self) was indeed Brahman in the beginning. It knew only Itself as, 'I am Brahman'. Therefore, It became all. And whoever among the gods knew It also became That; and the same with sages and men. The sage Vamadeva, while realising this (self) as That, knew, 'I was Manu, and the sun'. And to this day whoever in like manner knows It as, 'I am Brahman', becomes all this (universe). Even the gods cannot prevail against him, for he becomes their self. While he who worships another god thinking, 'He is one, and I am another', does not know. He is like an animal to the gods. As many animals serve a man, so does each man serve the gods. Even if one animal is taken away, it causes anguish, what should one say of many animals? Therefore, it is not liked by them that men should know this.

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् ।

Brahma Sutra 1.1.30

The Instruction (by Indra to Pratardana) is in conformity with the realization of the truth of the Śāstra (by Indra), as was in the case of Vāmadeva.

इन्द्रो नाम देवतात्मा स्वमात्मानं परमात्मत्वेन ‘अहमेव परं ब्रह्म’ इत्यार्षेण दर्शनेन यथाशास्त्रं पश्यन् उपदिशति स्म - ‘मामेव विजानीहि’ इति;
यथा ‘तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभव सूर्यश्च’ इति, तद्वत्; ‘तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्’ (ब्र।उप्। १।४।१०) इति श्रुतेः।

BSBh. 1.1.30

The deity Indra, realizing with the intuition of a Sage, that according to the Śāstra his own self was the Highest Self i.e. that he himself was the Highest Brahman, gave instruction (to Pratardana) thus – “Know me only”. Just as the Sage Vāmadeva, realizing this Brahman, understood (i.e. arrived at the knowledge), “I was Manu and the Sun” and “Whosoever amongst the Gods became enlightened, he indeed became that” (Br.Up. 1.4.10).

आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च

Brahma Sutra 4.1.3

(The Scriptures understand) that Īśvara i.e. Brahman is the Jīva-Self (Ātmā) and they (i.e. Scriptures) also cause it to be so understood.

आत्मेत्येव परमेश्वरः प्रतिपत्तव्यः। तथा हि परमेश्वरप्रक्रियायां जाबाला आत्मत्वेनैव एतमुपगच्छन्ति - ‘त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवतेऽहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते’ इति । तथा अन्येऽपि ‘अहं ब्रह्मास्मि’

इत्येवमादय आत्मत्वोपगमा द्रष्टव्याः । ग्राहयन्ति च आत्मत्वेनैव ईश्वरं वेदान्तवाक्यानि -

'एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।४।१)

'एष त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः' (ब्र्।उप् ।३।७।३)

'तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' (छन्।उप्। ६।८।७) इत्येवमादीनि

BSBh. 4.1.3

The Highest Lord should of course be understood to be the Ātmā (Jīva-Self), for even so do the Jābālas, in the chapter dealing with the Highest Lord, understood the Lord to be the Ātmā (Jīva-Self) thus – "Thou art indeed I, Oh blessed deity, and I indeed, am Thou". Similarly scriptural passages such as "I am Brahman" also should be looked upon as considering (the Highest Lord) as the Self. Vedānta texts such as "This your Self which is inside all" (Br.Up. 3.4.1), "This your Self which is the ruler within and is immortal" (Br.Up. 3.7.3), "That is the truth, that is the Self, that thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7), make us understand the Lord to be the Ātmā (i.e. the Jīva-Self).

Section 133

References:

तत्र विज्ञानात्मनो विकारपक्ष एता गतयः – पृथिवीद्रव्यवत् अनेकद्रव्यसमाहारस्य सावयवस्य परमात्मनः, एकदेशविपरिणामो

विज्ञानात्मा घटादिवत् ; पूर्वसंस्थानावस्थस्य वा परस्य एकदेशो विक्रियते केशोषरादिवत् , सर्व एव वा परः परिणमेत् क्षीरादिवत् । तत्र समानजातीयानेकद्रव्यसमूहस्य कश्चिदद्द्रव्यविशेषो विज्ञानात्मत्वं प्रतिपद्यते यदा, तदा समानजातीयत्वात् एकत्वमुपचरितमेव न तु परमार्थतः ; तथा च सति सिद्धान्तविरोधः । अथ नित्यायुतसिद्धावयवानुगतः अवयवी पर आत्मा, तस्य तदवस्थस्य एकदेशो विज्ञानात्मा संसारी – तदापि सर्वावयवानुगतत्वात् अवयविन एव अवयवगतो दोषो गुणो वेति, विज्ञानात्मनः संसारित्वदोषेण पर एव आत्मा सम्बध्यत इति, इयमप्यनिष्टा कल्पना । क्षीरवत् सर्वपरिणामपक्षे सर्वश्रुतिस्मृतिकोपः, स च अनिष्टः । 'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम्ऽ (श्वे। ६ । १९) 'दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजःऽ (मु। उ। २ । १ । २) 'आकाशवत्सर्वगतश्च नित्यःऽ (शत। ब्रा। १० । ६ । ३ । २) 'स वा एष महानज आत्माजरोऽमरोऽमृतःऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २५) 'न जायते म्रियते वा कदाचित्ऽ (भ। गी। २ । २०) 'अव्यक्तोऽयम्ऽ (भ। गी। २ । २५) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायविरुद्धा एते सर्वे पक्षाः । अचलस्य परमात्मन एकदेशपक्षे विज्ञानात्मनः कर्मफलदेशसंसरणानुपपत्तिः, परस्य वा संसारित्वम् – इत्युक्तम्

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Now, if the individual self be a modification of the Supreme Self, there may be the following alternatives: The Supreme Self may be an aggregate of many things and consist of parts, like the substance earth, and the individual self may be the modification of some portion of It, like a jar etc. Or the Supreme Self may retain Its

form, and a portion of It be modified, like hair or a barren tract, for instance. Or the entire Supreme Self may be modified, like milk etc. Now in the first view, according to which a particular thing out of an aggregate of a great many things of the same category becomes the individual self, since this particular thing is only of the same category, the identity is but figurative, not real. In that case it would be a contradiction of the verdict of the Śruti. If, however, (as in the second view) the Supreme Self is a whole eternally consisting of parts inseparably connected together, and, while It remains unchanged in form, a portion of It becomes the relative individual self, then, since the whole inheres in all the parts, it is affected by the merit or defect of each part; hence the Supreme Self will be subject to the evil of transmigration attaching to the individual self. Therefore, this view also is inadmissible; while the view that holds that the whole of the Supreme Self is transformed disregards all the Śrutis and Smṛtis and is therefore unacceptable. All these views contradict reason as well as Śruti and Smṛti texts such as, '(Brahman is) without parts, devoid of activity and serene' (Sv.Up. 6.19), 'The Supreme Being is resplendent, formless, including both within and without, and birthless' (Mund. 2.1.2), 'Allpervading like the sky and eternal,' 'That great, birthless Self is undecaying, immortal, undying' (Br.Up. 4.4.25), 'It is never born nor

dies' (Gita. 2.20) 'It is undifferentiated,' etc. (Gita. 2.25). If the individual self be a portion of the immutable Supreme Self, then it will find it impossible to go (after death) to places in accordance with its past work, or else the Supreme Self will, as already said, be subject to transmigration.

परस्यैकदेशः अग्निविस्फुलिङ्गवत् स्फुटितः विज्ञानात्मा संसरतीति चेत् । तथापि परस्यावयवस्फुटनेन क्षतप्राप्तिः, तत्संसरणे च परमात्मनः प्रदेशान्तरावयवव्यूहे छिद्रताप्राप्तिः, अव्रणत्ववाक्यविरोधश्च ; आत्मावयवभूतस्य विज्ञानात्मनः संसरणे परमात्मशून्यप्रदेशाभावात् अवयवान्तरनोदनव्यूहनाभ्यां हृदयशूलेनेव परमात्मनो दुःखित्वप्राप्तिः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Objection: Suppose we say that the individual self is a portion of the Supreme Self detached from It like a spark of fire, and that transmigrates.

Reply: Yet the Supreme Self will get a wound by this breaking off of Its part, and as that part transmigrates, it will make a hole in the assemblage of parts in another portion of the Supreme Self which will contradict the scriptural statements about Its being without any wound. If the individual self, which is a part of the Supreme Self, transmigrates, then, since there is no space without It, some other parts of It being pushed and displaced, the Supreme Self will feel pain as if It had colic in the heart.

अग्निविस्फुलिङ्गादिदृष्टान्तश्रुतेर्न दोष इति चेत् । न ; श्रुतेर्ज्ञापकत्वात् – न शास्त्रं पदार्थानन्यथा कर्तुं प्रवृत्तम् , किं तर्हि यथाभूतानाम् अज्ञातानां ज्ञापने

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Objection: There is nothing wrong in it, for there are Śruti texts giving illustrations of sparks of fire etc.

Reply: Not so, for the Śruti is merely informative. The scriptures seek not to alter things, but to supply information about things unknown, as they are.

'क्षुद्राविस्फुलिङ्गाःऽ (बृ। उ। २ । १ । २०) 'ममैवांशःऽ (भ। गी। १५ । ७) इति च श्रूयते स्मर्यते चेति चेत् । न, एकत्वप्रत्ययार्थपरत्वात् ; अग्नेर्हि विस्फुलिङ्गः अग्निरेव इत्येकत्वप्रत्ययार्हो दृष्टो लोके ; तथा च अंशः अंशिना एकत्वप्रत्ययार्हः ; तत्रैवं सति विज्ञानात्मनः परमात्मविकारांशत्ववाचकाः शब्दाः परमात्मैकत्वप्रत्ययाधित्सवः

Br.Up. 2.1.20 Bh.

Objection: But do not the Śruti and Smṛti say, 'Tiny sparks' (Br.Up. 2.1.20), and 'A part of Myself' (Gita 15.7)?
Reply: Not so, for the passages are meant to convey the idea of oneness. We notice in life that sparks of fire may be considered identical with tire. Similarly, a part may be considered identical with the whole. Such being the case, **words signifying a modification or part of the Supreme**

Self, as applied to the individual self, are meant to convey its identity with It.

अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके

Brahma Sutra 2.3.43

(The Jīva-Self) is a part (of Brahman) because of the representation (in the Scriptures) of its being different from the other, and that it is also non-different (from Brahman), because some (i.e. Ārtharvaṇikas) speak of Brahman, in another way also, as being a fisherman and a knave or a gambler etc.

जीव ईश्वरस्यांशो भवितुमर्हति, यथाग्नेर्विस्फुलिङ्गः । अंश इवांशः । न हि निरवयवस्य मुख्योंऽशः सम्भवति

BSBh. 2.3.43

The Jīva-Self deserves to be a part of the Lord even as the speck is a part of the fire. **When it is said that it is a part, what is meant is that it is a part, as it were. It is impossible that it could be a part in the principal or literal sense of that which is partless (i.e. the Lord).**

आभास एव च एष जीवः परस्यात्मनो जलसूर्यकादिवत्प्रतिपत्तव्यः

BSBh. 2.3.50

It should be understood that this Jīva-Self is but merely a false appearance i.e. reflection of the Highest Self, similar to the reflection of the sun in water.

Section 134

References:

एवमविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधीश्वरो भवति, व्योमेव घटकरकाद्युपाध्यनुरोधि । स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयानविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतकार्यकरणसङ्घातानुरोधिनो जीवाख्यान्विज्ञानात्मनः प्रतीष्टे व्यवहारविषये । तदेवमविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च, न परमार्थतो विद्यया अपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनि ईशित्रीशितव्यसर्वज्ञत्वादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते ; तथा चोक्तम् – ‘ यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमाऽ (छा। उ। ७ । २४ । १) इति ; ‘ यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्ऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यादि च

BSBh. 2.1.14

It is in this way that the Lord (as the Ishvara) conforms to the limiting adjuncts of names and forms produced by ignorance, just as the Akasha conforms to the limiting adjuncts of the jars and pots. During the condition of phenomenal existence, the Lord rules over the so called Jiva-Selfs i.e., the cognitional Selfs, which are but only his own alter egos and which conform to the multitude of effects and causes brought about by names and forms, which in their turn are brought about by ignorance, and stands in the same relation to these Jiva-Selfs i.e.

cognitional Selfs, as the great Akasha stands to the Akasha of the jars and pots. So the Lord's overlordship, omniscience and omnipotence, depend upon the determinate distinctions caused by the limiting adjuncts of ignorance, while in the truest sense, in the case of the Self whose limiting adjuncts have been swept off by knowledge, all such behaviour as that of being the ruler and the ruled or of being an omniscient entity etc., cannot be reasonably sustainable. The Scriptures also say so, thus "Where one does not see, hear or know anything, other than its Self, that is the great one" (Chand.Up. 7.24.1); "But when the Self alone has become all this, by what can one see, and whom (can one see)?" (Br.Up. 4.5.15).

तथाप्यात्मनोऽप्रच्युतात्मभावस्यैव

सतस्तत्त्वानवबोधनिमित्तो मिथ्यैव देहादिष्वनात्मसु आत्मत्वनिश्चयो लौकिको दृष्टः । तेन देहादिभूतस्यात्मनोऽपि आत्मा - अनन्विष्टः 'अन्वेष्टव्यः', अलब्धः 'लब्धव्यः', अश्रुतः 'श्रोतव्यः', अमतः 'मन्तव्यः', अविज्ञातः 'विज्ञातव्यः' - इत्यादिभेदव्यपदेश उपपद्यते । प्रतिषिध्यत एव तु परमार्थतः सर्वज्ञात्परमेश्वरादन्यो द्रष्टा श्रोता वा 'नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।७।२३) इत्यादिना

परमेश्वरस्तु अविद्याकल्पिताच्छारीरात्कर्तुर्भोक्तुः विज्ञानात्माख्यात् अन्यः । यथा मायाविनश्चर्मखड्गधरात्सूत्रेणाकाशमधिरोहतः स एव मायावी परमार्थरूपो भूमिष्ठोऽन्यः । यथा वा घटाकाशादुपाधिपरिच्छिन्नादनुपाधिपरिच्छिन्न आकाशोऽन्यः

BSBh. 1.1.17

But the Self, even though it is something which never deviates from its own selfhood (nature), yet, in ordinary life, we see (the phenomenon), that because of not having properly understood the truth, there is a conviction that the body etc. which really are not the Selfs, are the Selfs. And therefore, in the case of the Jīva-Self which has (through ignorance) egoistically identified itself with a body, scriptural instruction which makes a difference (between the highest Self and the Jīva-Self), thus – "The Self, which is not yet searched for, deserves to be searched, which is not yet heard, deserves to be heard, which is not yet cogitated upon, deserves to be cogitated upon, and which is not yet understood, deserves to be understood", becomes reasonably sustainable. But the scriptures in the ultimate real sense do deny, of course, any seer or hearer, other than the omniscient supreme Lord, thus – "Than this, there is no other seer etc." (Br.Up. 3.7.23). **As for the supreme Lord, he is different from the one, who**

through ignorance is wrongly conceived to be the cognitional Self (Vijñānātmā) and the agent or doer and the experiencer. Just as the real illusionist par excellence who stands on the ground, is different from the other illusory person, who appears to ascend into the sky by a rope with a sword and a leather shield in his hand, or just as the real Ākāśa uncircumscribed by any limiting adjunct, is different from the Ākāśa in a jar, which is circumscribed with such a limiting adjunct (viz. the jar).

पर एवात्मा देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्ध्युपाधिभिः परिच्छिद्यमानो बालैः शारीर इत्युपचर्यते । यथा घटकरकाद्युपाधिवशादपरिच्छिन्नमपि नभः परिच्छिन्नवदवभासते, तद्वत् । तदपेक्षया च कर्मकर्तृत्वादिभेदव्यवहारो न विरुध्यते । प्राक् 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यात्मैकत्वोपदेशग्रहणात्

BSBh. 1.2.6

It is but only the Highest Self which comes to have finite determination (as it were), by reason of limiting adjuncts such as body, sense-organs, the mind and intelligence, and which is **mistakenly and in a figurative sense accepted by the ignorant as the embodied Jīva-Self**, just as the Ākāśa (Nabhas) which in fact is unlimited, appears as if it is limited, on account of limiting adjuncts such as a jar or a pot etc. **And taking into consideration this difference with reference to it (i.e. the limiting**

adjuncts), the treating of the one as the object (i.e. the Highest Self) and the other as the agent (i.e. the Jīva-Self), is not contradictory, as long as a person has not received instruction about the Self (Ātmā) being the only one, by such scriptural passage as "That thou art" etc.

तदेवमविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च, न परमार्थतो विद्यया अपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनि ईशित्रीशितव्यसर्वज्ञत्वादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते ; तथा चोक्तम् – ' यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमाऽ (छा। उ। ७ । २४ । १) इति ; ' यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्ऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यादि च । एवं परमार्थावस्थायां सर्वव्यवहाराभावं वदन्ति वेदान्ताः सर्वे । तथेश्वरगीतास्वपि – ' न कर्तृत्वं न कर्माणि लोकस्य सृजति प्रभुः । न कर्मफलसंयोगं स्वभावस्तु प्रवर्ततेऽ (भ। गी। ५ । १४) ॥ ' नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापं न चैव सुकृतं विभुः । अज्ञानेनावृतं ज्ञानं तेन मुह्यन्ति जन्तवःऽ (भ। गी। ५ । १५) इति परमार्थावस्थायामीशित्रीशितव्यादिव्यवहाराभावः प्रदर्श्यते ; व्यवहारावस्थायां तूक्तः श्रुतावपीश्वरादिव्यवहारः – ' एष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसम्भेदायऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २२) इति । तथा चेश्वरगीतास्वपि – ' ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति । भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि माययाऽ (भ। गी। १८ । ६१) इति

BSBh. 2.1.14

So the Lord's overlordship, omniscience and omnipotence, depend upon the determinate distinctions caused by the limiting adjuncts of Nescience, while in the truest sense, in the case of the Self whose limiting adjuncts have been swept off by knowledge, all such behaviour as that of being the ruler and the ruled or of being an omniscient entity etc., cannot be reasonably sustainable. The Scriptures also say so, thus"Where one does not see, hear or know anything, other than its Self, that is the great one" (Chand. Up. 7.24.1); "But when the Self alone has become all this, by what can one see, and whom (can one see)?" (Br.Up. 4.5.15). And in this manner, **all Vedanta texts declare, that in the condition of the Highest Truth, there is absence of all phenomenal transactions.** In the (Lord's) Gita also, in the passage "The Lord does not create in anyone, the capacity to act, nor any actions, nor their connection to the fruit, but they tend towards activity by reason of their own nature. He neither receives the sins nor the merits of any person. Knowledge is enveloped in ignorance and hence creatures become infatuated i.e. confused" (Gita 5.14, Gita 5.15), it is indicated that there is absence of all behaviour as that of a ruler or the ruled in the condition of perfect knowledge, while in the condition of

phenomenal existence, even the scriptures do speak of the Self's behaviour as the Lord thus "He is the Lord of all, the King and the protector of all beings, and he is the bund which upholds the worlds so that they may not be confounded (by promiscuity)" (Br.Up. 4.4.22). Similarly, it is said in the (Lord's) Gita again "Oh Arjuna, the Lord is immanent in the region of the heart of all beings, and by this power of Maya makes them go round and round as in a roundabout" (Gita. 18.61).

Section 135

References:

यावदेव चायं बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धः, तावदेवास्य जीवत्वं संसारित्वं च ; परमार्थतस्तु न जीवो नाम बुद्ध्युपाधिपरिकल्पितस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणास्ति ; न हि नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपात्सर्वज्ञादीश्वरादन्यश्चेतनो धातुर्द्वितीयो वेदान्तार्थनिरूपणायामुपलभ्यते – ‘ नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता विज्ञाताऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ७ । २३) ‘ नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ श्रोतृ मन्तृ विज्ञातृऽ (ब्र्। उ। ३ । ८ । ११) ‘ तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) ‘ अहं ब्रह्मास्मिऽ (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) इत्यादिश्रुतिशतेभ्यः

BSBh. 2.3.30

That the Jīva-Self has the characteristic of being a Jīva-Self and has a transmigratory condition. In the truest sense, however,

as apart from such nature imagined through association with the limiting adjunct of intelligence, there is no such entity as the Jīva-Self. During the ascertainment of the proper meaning of the Vedas, no sentient Supreme Spirit (Dhātu) other than the Omniscient Lord which has the nature of being eternally free is to be met with, on considering hundreds of scriptural passages such as "There is no other seer, hearer, thinker and knower, other than this" (Br.Up. 3.7.23), "There is nothing else than this. That is the seer, hearer, thinker or knower" (Br.Up. 3.8.11), "That thou art" (Chan.Up. 6.8.7), I am Brahman" (Br.Up. 1.4.10), etc.

अपरे तु वादिनः पारमार्थिकमेव जैवं रूपमिति मन्यन्तेऽस्मदीयाश्च केचित् ।
तेषां सर्वेषामात्मैकत्वसम्यग्दर्शनप्रतिपक्षभूतानां प्रतिषेधायेदं शारीरकमारब्धम् - एक एव परमेश्वरः कूटस्थनित्यो विज्ञानधातुरविद्यया, मायया मायाविवत्, अनेकधा विभाव्यते । नान्यो विज्ञानधातुरस्तीति

BSBh. 1.3.19

Some others again, including some from amongst us, consider that the nature of the Jīva-Self is in fact real. It is with the intention of making these people, who have ranged themselves as the opponents of the view of the unity of the Self and correct knowledge, that this Śārīraka is begun (by the Ācārya), (The correct view being) that

there is but one and only one, the Highest Lord, who is eternally immoveable and has the essence of knowledge as his structure, who under the influence of ignorance i.e. illusion (Māyā) is, as by an illusionist, made to appear in different ways, and that there is nothing else which has this essence of knowledge as its structure.

Section 136

References:

यत्तूक्तम् - न विरुद्धगुणयोरन्योन्यात्मत्वसम्भव इति । नायं दोषः, विरुद्धगुणताया मिथ्यात्वोपपत्तेः । यत्पुनरुक्तम् - ईश्वराभाव-प्रसङ्ग इति ।

तदसत्, शास्त्रप्रामाण्यात् । अनभ्युपगमाच्च । न हि ईश्वरस्य संसार्यात्मत्वं प्रतिपाद्यत इत्यभ्युपगच्छामः - किं तर्हि? – संसारिणः संसारित्वापोहेन ईश्वरात्मत्वं प्रतिपिपादयिषितमिति । एवं च सति अद्वैतेश्वरस्य अपहतपाप्मत्वादि-गुणता विपरीत-गुणता तु इतरस्य मिथ्येति व्यवतिष्ठते ।

यदप्युक्तम् - अधिकार्यभावः प्रत्यक्षादि-विरोधश्चेति । तदप्यसत्, प्राक्प्रबोधात् संसारित्वाभ्युपगमात् । अद्विषयत्वाच्च प्रत्यक्षादि-व्यवहारस्य

BSBh. 4.1.3

Objection: As regards the statement (by the opponent of Vedānta), that it is not possible for entities having

opposite natures to be the Self of each other (i.e. to be mutually identical)

Reply: This is no fault, because it is reasonably sustainable, that the notion of their possessing natures opposed to each other, is illusory.

Objection: As regards the statement that there would be the predicament of the non-existence of the Lord.

Reply: That also is not so, because of the authority of the Śāstra. And also because we do not understand (as you the opponent of Vedānta do) that the Lord himself has the nature of the transmigratory Jīva-Self. We understand that the scriptures do not propound that the Lord is the transmigratory Jīva-Self, but on the other hand we do understand that the Scriptures aim at propounding, by denying the transmigratory nature of the Jīva-Self itself, that it is the Lord. This being so, it is determined, that the non-dual Lord has the nature of being free from all sinfulness, and that the (supposed) contrary nature of the Jīva-Self, is illusory.

Objection: With regard to the statement (by the opponent of Vedānta) that there would be the absence of any person competent (to study the Vedānta Śāstra) and that such means-of-proof as direct perception would be contradicted.

Reply: that also is not so, because it is understood by us, **that prior to the realization of knowledge, the Jīva-**

Self by all means, does indeed have such transmigratory nature and it is during such condition that the operation of such means-of-proof, as direct perception etc. takes place.

यत्तूक्तम् 'ईश्वरस्य क्षेत्रज्ञैकत्वे संसारित्वं प्राप्नोति, क्षेत्रज्ञानां च ईश्वरैकत्वे संसारिणः अभावात् संसाराभावप्रसङ्गःऽ इति, एतौ दोषौ प्रत्युक्तौ 'विद्याविद्ययोः वैलक्षण्याभ्युपगमात्ऽ इति । कथम् ? अविद्यापरिकल्पितदोषेण तद्विषयं वस्तु पारमार्थिकं न दुष्यतीति । तथा च दृष्टान्तः दर्शितः – मरीच्यम्भसा ऊषरदेशो न पङ्कीक्रियते इति

संसारिणः अभावात् संसाराभावप्रसङ्गदोषोऽपि संसारसंसारिणोः अविद्याकल्पितत्वोपपत्त्या प्रत्युक्तः

BGh. 13.2

As for the objection that, if Bhagavān be one with the knower of the field, He will then become a mundane being, and that, if the knowers of the fields are one with Bhagavān, then from the nonexistence of mundane beings will follow the absence of the mundane state, - these two objections have been refuted by admitting Knowledge and ignorance as having different characteristics.

Objection: How?

Reply: By saying that **any defect imagined through ignorance does not affect the supreme Reality which is the substratum of that (imagination).** In accordance with this, an illustration was cited that a desert is not made

muddy by water in a mirage. Even the defect of the possibility of non-existence of the mundane state, consequent on the non-existence of individual Ātman(s), stands refuted by the explanation that the mundane state and the individual Ātman(s) are imagined through ignorance.

Section 137

References:

ननु लौकिको जन्ममरणव्यपदेशो जीवस्य दर्शितः ; सत्यं दर्शितः ; भाक्तस्त्वेष जीवस्य जन्ममरणव्यपदेशः । किमाश्रयः पुनरयं मुख्यः, यदपेक्षया भाक्त इति ? उच्यते – चराचरव्यपाश्रयः ; स्थावरजङ्गमशरीरविषयौ जन्ममरणशब्दौ ; स्थावरजङ्गमानि हि भूतानि जायन्ते च म्रियन्ते च ; अतस्तद्विषयौ जन्ममरणशब्दौ मुख्यौ सन्तौ तत्स्थे जीवात्मन्युपचर्येते, तद्भावभावित्वात् – शरीरप्रादुर्भावतिरोभावयोर्हि सतोर्जन्ममरणशब्दौ भवतः, नासतोः ; न हि शरीरसम्बन्धादन्यत्र जीवो जातो मृतो वा केनचिल्लक्ष्यते

BSBh. 2.3.16

Opponent: But it is indicated that in the ordinary world the terms birth and death are used with reference to the Jīva-Self.

Reply: It is no doubt true that you have indicated that it is so, but **this reference to the birth and death of the Jīva-Self is in a secondary sense.**

Objection: With reference to what entity then can this reference possibly be in the primary (i.e. real) sense, if this reference (in the case of the Jīva-Self) is in the secondary sense?

Reply: The reference is in the primary i.e. true sense with respect to the entire set of moveable and immoveable entities. These terms ‘Birth’ and ‘Death’ have reference to the bodies of moveable and immoveable entities. These moveable and immoveable entities both come into being and die. Hence, while the terms ‘Birth’ and ‘Death’ are used in the principal (i.e. real) sense with reference to these entities, they are used figuratively in the case of the Jīva-Selfs which abide in them, because these terms are used, only if such bodies exist. It is only when a body becomes manifest or disappears, that these terms ‘Birth’ and ‘Death’ are used, and not when it does not either manifest itself or disappear. No one has ever observed a Jīva-Self being born, or observed it to have died, elsewhere than when it is related to a body.

न ह्यात्मनः शरीरात्माभिमानलक्षणं मिथ्याज्ञानं मुक्त्वा अन्यतः सशरीरत्वं शक्यं कल्पयितुम् । नित्यम् अशरीरत्वम् अकर्मनिमित्तत्वाद् इत्यवोचाम ।
तत्कृतधर्माधर्म-निमित्तं सशरीरत्वमिति चेत् । न;
शरीरसम्बन्धस्यासिद्धत्वात् । धर्माधर्मयोरात्मकृतत्वासिद्धेः ।
शरीरसम्बन्धस्य धर्माधर्मयोस्तत्कृतत्वस्य चेतरेतराश्रयत्व-प्रसङ्गात् ।
अन्धपरम्परैषा अनादित्वकल्पना

BSBh. 1.1.4

In the case of the Self it is not possible to conceive of any corporeality for the Self, otherwise than by the wrong-knowledge (ignorance) of the nature of the vanity of the Self being possessed of a body. We have already said that the Self is eternally without a body, because of its not having action as its cause.

Objection: If it is urged that corporeality is caused by meritorious and unmeritorious actions

Reply: No, because in as much as the relation of the Self with a body is not yet properly established, any assumption about the Self having performed meritorious or unmeritorious actions is even still less established. And also because the assumption of corporeality to the Self as depending upon meritorious and unmeritorious actions and of meritorious and unmeritorious actions as depending upon the corporeality of the Self, would, lead (us) towards (the fallacy of) mutual interdependence as cause and effect. And this notion about the

beginninglessness (of these two) would be like a series of the blind leading the blind (Andha-paramparā).

‘ऋतौ भार्यामुपेयात्s इत्यनुज्ञा, ‘ गुर्वङ्गनां नोपगच्छेत्s इति परिहारः ; तथा ‘ अग्नीषोमीयं पशुं संज्ञपयेत्s इत्यनुज्ञा, ‘ न हिंस्यात्सर्वा भूतानिs इति परिहारः ; – एवं लोकेऽपि मित्रमुपसेवितव्यमित्यनुज्ञा, शत्रुः परिहर्तव्य इति परिहारः – एवंप्रकारावनुज्ञापरिहारौ एकत्वेऽप्यात्मनः देहसम्बन्धात् स्याताम् । देहैः सम्बन्धो देहसम्बन्धः । कः पुनर्देहसम्बन्धः ? देहादिरयं सङ्घातोऽहमेव – इत्यात्मनि विपरीतप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः ; दृष्टा च सा सर्वप्राणिनाम् – अहं गच्छामि अहमागच्छामि, अहमन्धः अहमनन्धः, अहं मूढः अहममूढः इत्येवमात्मिका ; न हि अस्याः सम्यग्दर्शनादन्यन्निवारकमस्ति ; प्राक्तु सम्यग्दर्शनात्प्रततैषा भ्रान्तिः सर्वजन्तुषु । तदेवमविद्यानिमित्तदेहाद्युपाधिसम्बन्धकृताद्विशेषादैकात्म्याभ्युपगमेऽप्यनुज्ञापरिहारावकल्पेते

BSBh. 2.3.48

Though the Self is but one only, injunctions and prohibitions of the following sort become feasible through its (i.e. the Self’s) contact with bodies. Thus – injunction, for instance, that “the wife should be approached at the proper time”, or a prohibition that “the wife of a preceptor must never be approached”, or injunction that “an animal should be sacrificed as an offering to Agni and Soma”, or a prohibition that “no beings should be killed”,
or even in the ordinary world, a permission that “a friend should be entertained”, or a prohibition that “an enemy

should not be neglected" etc. contact with the bodies is 'body-contact'.

Now, what is this body-contact?

It consists in the origination in the Self of the erroneous notion that the Self is the aggregate consisting of the body and so on. This erroneous notion is seen to prevail in all living beings, and finds its expression in thoughts such as the following: 'I go,' 'I come,' 'I am blind,' 'I am not blind,' 'I am confused,' 'I am not confused.' Now, nothing else but true knowledge is able to remove this perverse notion, and this confusion i.e. delusion is constantly present in all beings, before true knowledge dawns, and even though the oneness of the Self is properly understood, such injunctions and prohibitions become plausible because of the notion of difference (between the Jīva-Self and Brahman) created by the Self's contact with limiting adjuncts such as a body etc., brought about by ignorance.

न च शास्त्रानर्थक्यम्, यथाप्रसिद्धाविद्वत्पुरुषविषयत्वात् शास्त्रस्य। अविदुषां हि फलहेत्वोः अनात्मनोः आत्मदर्शनम्, न विदुषाम्, विदुषां हि फलहेतुभ्याम् आत्मनः अन्यत्वदर्शने सति, तयोः अहमिति आत्मदर्शनानुपपत्तेः। न हि अत्यन्तमूढः उन्मत्तादिरपि जलाग्न्योः छायाप्रकाशयोर्वा ऐकात्म्यं पश्यति, किमुत विवेकी

BGh. 13.2

Nor do the scriptures become purposeless, because the scriptures are applicable to the commonly known unenlightened person. It is indeed in the case of the ignorant person – not in the case of the enlightened one – that there occurs the perception of identity of the Self with the effect (that is enjoyership) and the cause (that is agentship) which are not-Self. For, in the case of the enlightened persons, it is impossible that, after the dawn of the realization of non-identity of the Self with effect and cause, they can have Self-identification with these as 'I'. Surely, not even a downright fool, or a lunatic and such others, see water and fire or shade and light as identical; what to speak of a discriminating person!

Section 138

References:

यथैकस्मिन्घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्युते ।

न सर्वे सम्प्रयुज्यन्ते तद्वज्जीवाः सुखादिभिः

Ma.Up.Ka 3.5 (Karika)

As any portion of Ākāśa enclosed in a pot being soiled by dust, smoke, etc., all such other portions of Ākāśa

enclosed in other pots are not soiled, so is the happiness, etc., of the Jīvas, i.e., the happiness, misery, etc., of one Jīva do not affect other Jīvas.

सर्वदेहेष्वात्मैकत्वे एकस्मिन् जननमरणसुखदुःखादिमत्यात्मनि सर्वात्मनां तत्सम्बन्धः क्रियाफलसाङ्कर्यं च स्यादिति ये त्वाहुर्द्वैतिनः, तान्प्रतीदमुच्यते – यथा एकस्मिन् घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिः युते संयुक्ते, न सर्वे घटाकाशादयः तद्रजोधूमादिभिः संयुज्यन्ते, तद्वत् जीवाः सुखादिभिः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.5 Bh.

The dualists contend that if one Atman exists in all bodies then the birth, death, happiness, etc., of one Atman (as Jiva) must affect all and, further, there must follow a confusion regarding the results of the action (done by individuals). This contention is, thus refuted: As the Ākāśa enclosed within one jar being soiled by dust, smoke, etc., does not make the Ākāśa enclosed in other jars soiled with the dust and the smoke, so all created beings are not affected by the happiness, etc. (of one Jiva).

न हि कर्तुर्भोक्तुश्चात्मनः सन्ततः सर्वैः शरीरैः सम्बन्धोऽस्ति । उपाधितन्त्रो हि जीव इत्युक्तम् । उपाध्यसन्तानाच्च नास्ति जीवसन्तानः - ततश्च कर्मव्यतिकरः फलव्यतिकरो वा न भविष्यति

BSBh. 2.3.49

There is no constant and comprehensive connection of the Jīva-Self who is an agent and an experiencer, with all bodies. It has been said already that the Jīva-Self is subject to limiting adjuncts, and **because of these limiting adjuncts not being comprehensive and constant (Asantānāt), there could be no simultaneous connection of the Jīva-Self with all bodies, and hence there could not be any confusion of actions or confusion of fruits of actions.**

आभास एव च एष जीवः परस्यात्मनो जलसूर्यकादिवत्प्रतिपत्तव्यः । न स एव साक्षात्, नापि वस्त्वन्तरम् । अतश्च यथा नैकस्मिञ्जलसूर्यके कम्पमाने जलसूर्यकान्तरं कम्पते । एवं नैकस्मिञ्जीवे कर्मफलसम्बन्धिनि जीवान्तरस्य तत्सम्बन्धः । एवमव्यतिकर एव कर्मफलयोः

BSBh. 2.3.50

It should be understood, that this Jīva-Self is but merely a false appearance i.e. reflection of the Highest Self, similar to the reflection of the sun in water. It is neither the Highest Self actually, nor is it quite a different entity altogether. Hence, just as when one reflection of the sun

in one piece of water vibrates, another such reflection of the sun in another piece of water does not vibrate. Similarly, when one Jīva-Self is in contact with the fruits of actions, another Jīva-Self is not in contact with these fruits of action, and thus there is no confusion of Jīva-Selfs and fruits of actions.

मरणे सम्भवे चैव गत्यागमनयोरपि ।

स्थितौ सर्वशरीरेषु चाकाशेनाविलक्षणः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.9 (Karika)

Ātman, in regard to its birth, death, going and coming (i.e., transmigration) and its existing in different bodies, is not dissimilar to the Ākāśa (i.e., the Ghaṭākāśa or the ether portioned off by a jar).

घटाकाशजन्मनाशगमनागमनस्थितिवत्सर्वशरीरेष्वात्मनो
जन्ममरणादिराकाशेनाविलक्षणः प्रत्येतव्य इत्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.9 Bh.

The meaning implied is that it should be known that, like the origination, destruction, going, coming and existence of the ether enclosed within a jar, the birth, death, etc. of the Self in all the bodies, too, appear.

Section 139

References:

तथा च ब्राह्मणम् - 'अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' (छन्।उप्। ६।३।२) । इत्येवंजातीयकं परस्यैवात्मनो जीवभावेनावस्थानं दर्शयति

BSBh. 1.4.22

A Brāhmaṇa passage also says similarly, thus – "I shall enter into (the body) as the Jīva-Self and evolve names and forms" (Chan.Up. 6.3.2), which shows that it is only the Highest Self that abides (in the body) in the condition of the Jīva-Self.

न च ब्रह्मणोऽन्यो गुहायां निहितोऽस्ति, 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्' (तैत्।उप्। २।६।१) इति स्रष्टुरेव प्रवेशश्रवणात्

BSBh. 1.4.22

The scriptural passage "Having created that, it entered into it" (Tait.Up 2.6) makes it clear, that no Self other than the Highest Self abides in the cave.

जीवो हि नाम देवताया आभासमात्रम् , बुद्ध्यादि भूतमात्रासंसर्गजनितः – आदर्शे इव प्रविष्टः पुरुषप्रतिबिम्बः, जलादिष्विव च सूर्यादीनाम् । अचिन्त्यानन्तशक्तिमत्या देवतायाः बुद्ध्यादिसम्बन्धः चैतन्याभासः देवतास्वरूपविवेकाग्रहणनिमित्तः सुखी दुःखी मूढ इत्याद्यनेकविकल्पप्रत्ययहेतुः । छायामात्रेण जीवरूपेणानुप्रविष्टत्वात्

देवता न दैहिकैः स्वतः सुखदुःखादिभिः सम्बध्यते – यथा पुरुषादित्यादयः आदर्शोदकादिषु च्छायामात्रेणानुप्रविष्टाः आदर्शोदकादिदोषैर्न सम्बध्यन्ते – तद्वद्देवतापि

Chand.Up. 6.3.2 Bh.

An individual soul is merely a reflection of the Deity. It arises from (Its) contact with the subtle elements in the form of intellect etc. It is like a reflection of a person, seeming to have entered into a mirror, and like (the reflection of) the sun etc. in water etc. The contact of the Deity possessed of inscrutable and infinite power, with the intellect etc. is (in the form of) a reflection of consciousness. This becomes the cause of multifarious and conflicting ideas such as, 'I am happy', 'I am sorrowful', 'I am ignorant', etc. owing to the non-realisation of the true nature of the Deity. Since the Deity has entered merely as a reflection in the form of an individual soul, therefore It does not Itself become connected with physical happiness, sorrow, etc. As a person, the sun, and others entering into a mirror, water, etc. merely through their reflections, are not touched by the defects of the mirror, water, etc. so also the Deity is not.

ननु च्छायामात्रश्चेज्जीवः मृषैव प्राप्तः, तथा परलोकेहलोकादि च तस्य । नैष दोषः, सदात्मना सत्यत्वाभ्युपगमात् । सर्वं च नामरूपादि सदात्मनैव सत्यं विकारजातम् । स्वतस्त्वनृतमेव, 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम्' (छा। उ। ६ । ४ । १) इत्युक्तत्वात् । तथा जीवोऽपीति । यक्षानुरूपो हि बलिरिति न्यायप्रसिद्धिः

Chand.Up. 6.3.2 Bh.

Objection: If the individual sould be a mere reflection, then it becomes reduced to unreality, and so also are its attainment of the other world, this world, etc.

Reply: There is no such defect, since it is admitted to be true in its real nature as Existence. And **all modifications such as names, forms, etc. are true only in their nature as Existence**. But by themselves they are surely unreal because it has been said: 'All transformations has speech as its basis' (Chand.Up. 6.4.1). So also, in an individual soul. There is the wellknown proverb that 'An offering should be in accordance with the nature of the demigod.'

इदं हि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञयोरितरेतरस्वभावाविवेककृतं कल्प्यते । परमार्थतस्तु नान्यतरस्यापि सम्भवति, अचेतनत्वात्सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियत्वाच्च क्षेत्रज्ञस्य । अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्वभावत्वाच्च सत्त्वस्य सुतरां न सम्भवति

BSBh. 1.2.12

It is thought that the attributes of being an experiencer and an agent, are the result of the failure to discriminate properly between the respective natures of 'Sattva' and 'Kṣetrajña', while in the ultimate true (absolute) sense, it

is not at all possible in the case of either, inasmuch as the 'Sattva' is non-sentient and the 'Kṣetrajña' (cognizer in the body) is not liable to modifications. It is even less possible in the case of 'Sattva' whose nature is brought about by ignorance.

यावद्ध्यविद्या न निवर्तते । तावद्धर्मादिगोचरत्वं जीवस्य जीवत्वं च न निवर्तते । तन्निवृत्तौ तु प्राज्ञ एव 'तत्त्वमसि' इति श्रुत्या प्रत्याय्यते

BSBh. 1.4.6

As long as ignorance is not removed, the Jīva-Self is possessed of all the attributes, and the condition of its being the Jīva-Self is not removed, but when once ignorance is removed, the Jīva-Self is caused to be understood as the Intelligential Highest Self, by the scriptural passage – "That thou art" etc.

Section 140

References:

ईश्वरश्चेदनात्मा स्यान् नासावस्मीति धारयेत् ।

आत्मा चेदीश्वरोऽस्मीति विद्या सान्यनिवर्तिका

UPS Metrical 3.1

If the Lord is non-Atman, one ought not to dwell upon [the

knowledge] “I am He.” If He is Atman, the knowledge “I am the Lord” destroys the other [knowledge].

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा।
कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च
Sv.Up. 6.11 (sruti)
The Lord, who is one only, is hidden in all beings. He is all-pervading and is the inner self of all creatures. He presides over all actions, and all beings reside in Him. He is the witness, and He is the Pure Consciousness free from the three Gunas of Nature.

यथा च आकाशो घटादिषु गच्छत्सु गच्छन्निव विभाव्यमानोऽपि न परमार्थतो गच्छति । यथा च उदशरावादिकम्पनात्तद्गते सूर्यप्रतिबिम्बे कम्पमानेऽपि ।
न तद्वान्सूर्यः कम्पते - एवमविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापिते बुद्ध्याद्युपहिते जीवाख्ये अंशे दुःखायमानेऽपि । न तद्वानीश्वरो दुःखायते । जीवस्यापि दुःखप्राप्तिरविद्यानिमित्तैवेत्युक्तम् । तथा च
अविद्यानिमित्तजीवभावव्युदासेन ब्रह्मभावमेव जीवस्य प्रतिपादयन्ति वेदान्ताः - ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येवमादयः
BSBh. 2.3.46
Or just as the Ākāśa [within it] is seen to be moving, when earthen pots etc. are moving, but it does not itself move in fact, or just as when a reflection of the sun in a water-trough appears to vibrate when the water-trough is shaken, but the sun whose reflection it is, does not vibrate in fact, even so, when the so-called Jīva-Self

which is but only a portion as it were (of the Lord), and is brought into existence by ignorance and is then equipped with intellect, suffers from pain (or rather appears so to suffer). The Lord, whose part (as it were) the Jīva-Self is, is not in the least affected by any such pain. We have said already that even the supposed suffering of pain by the Jīva-Self, is caused by ignorance (and it is not real). And the Vedānta texts uniformly expound, how, when **the Jīva-Self's notion of selfhood, which is brought into being by ignorance**, is itself effaced, the Jīva-Self is nothing but the Highest Self or Brahman itself, By such Scriptural passages as "That thou art" etc.

अयं हि वृक्ष ऊर्ध्वमूलोऽवाक्शाखोऽश्वत्थोऽव्यक्तमूलप्रभवः क्षेत्रसंज्ञकः सर्वप्राणिकर्मफलाश्रयः, तं परिष्वक्तवन्तौ सुपर्णाविव अविद्याकामकर्मवासनाश्रयलिङ्गोपाध्यात्मेश्वरौ । तयोः परिष्वक्तयोः अन्यः एकः क्षेत्रज्ञो लिङ्गोपाधिवृक्षमाश्रितः पिप्पलं कर्मनिष्पन्नं सुखदुःखलक्षणं फलं स्वादु अनेकविचित्रवेदनास्वादरूपं स्वादु अत्ति भक्षयत्युपभुङ्क्ते अविवेकतः । अनश्नन् अन्यः इतरः ईश्वरो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावः सर्वज्ञः सत्त्वोपाधिरीश्वरो नाश्नाति । प्रेरयिता ह्यसावुभयोर्भोज्यभोक्त्रोर्नित्यसाक्षित्वसत्तामात्रेण । स तु अनश्नन् अन्यः अभिचाकशीति पश्यत्येव केवलम् । दर्शनमात्रं हि तस्य प्रेरयितृत्वं राजवत्

Mund.Up. 3.1.1 Bh.

This is the banyan tree that has its roots upward and branches downward that sprouts up from its materials cause, the Unmanifested, and is called the field and provides a support for all the results of karmas of all beings. The Lord and the soul as conditioned by the subtle body which holds in itself the tendencies and impressions created by ignorance, desire, and action cling to it like birds. Of these two who hug this tree; the one (the individual soul) the knower of the field who clings to the tree of the subtle body that is its limiting adjunct; eats, enjoys, owing to nondiscrimination the fruit, consisting of happiness and misery brought about by action; which is full of tastes, consisting in the experience of multifarious mental reactions. Without tasting, the other, the Lord who is by nature eternal, pure, wise, and free, who is omniscient and has the totality of Maya as His limiting adjunct that Lord does not taste; for merely by His presence as the eternal witness, He is the director of both the enjoyer and the enjoyed. He, the other one, merely looks on, without enjoying; for His directorship consists in mere observation, as in the case of a king.

Section 141

References:

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं शरीरेन्द्रियमनोभिः सहितं संयुतमात्मानं भोक्तेति संसारीति आहुः मनीषिणः विवेकिनः । न हि केवलस्यात्मनो भोक्तृत्वमस्ति ; बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिकृतमेव तस्य भोक्तृत्वम् । तथा च श्रुत्यन्तरं केवलस्याभोक्तृत्वमेव दर्शयति – 'ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ७) इत्यादि । एवं च सति वक्ष्यमाणरथकल्पनया वैष्णवस्य पदस्यात्मतया प्रतिपत्तिरुपपद्यते, नान्यथा, स्वभावानतिक्रमात्

Kath.Up. 1.3.4 Bh.

The discriminating people, call the Self as associated with body, organs, and mind; as bhokta, the enjoyer, the transmigrating soul. **For the absolute Self can have no enjoyership;** Its enjoyership is in fact created by the limiting adjuncts such as the intellect etc. Thus, also there is another Vedic text which shows the nonenjoyership of the absolute (Self): 'It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were' etc. (Br.Up. 4.3.7).

Only if this is so, does it become apporpriate to attain the state of Visnu as one's own, through the analogy of the chariot which is going to be elaborated; but not otherwise, because one cannot transcend one's (true) nature.

नान्यदन्यद् भवेद् यस्मान् नान्यत् किंचिद् विचिन्तयेत् ।

अन्यस्यान्यत्वभावे हि नाशस्तस्य ध्रुवो भवेत्

UPS Metrical 15.1

As one thing cannot be another, one should consider that no thing is anything else, since if one thing could be another, it would certainly perish.

सिद्धादेवाहमित्यस्माद् युष्मद्धर्मो निषिध्यते ।
रज्ज्वामिवाहिधीर्युक्त्या तत् त्वमित्यादिशासनैः

UPS Metrical 18.4

From this [self-] established [Atman which is indicated by the word] "I" the attribute "you" is excluded– just as the notion of a serpent [is excluded] in application to a rope– by means of reasoning and such teachings as "Thou art That" and so forth.

यत्पुनरुक्तम् -- देहस्यात्मन्यसत्त्वे प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः स्यादिति, तन्न, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः आत्मनि देहस्य सत्त्वानुपलब्धेः। न ह्यात्मनि -- कुण्डे बदरम्, क्षीरे सर्पिः, तिले तैलम्, भित्तौ चित्रमिव च -- प्रत्यक्षादिभिः देह उपलभ्यते। तस्मान्न प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः

UPS Prose, 2.59

It is not a fact that the absolute non-existence of the body contradicts sense-perception etc., inasmuch as the existence of the body in the Self is not known by these evidences. The body is not known to exist in the Self by perception etc., like a plum in a hole, ghee in milk, oil in

sesame or a picture painted on a wall. There is, therefore, no contradiction to sense-perception etc.

अचक्षुष्ट्वादिशास्त्राच् च नेन्द्रियाणि सदा मम ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति चाथर्वणे वचः
UPS Metrical 13.12
And as the scripture says that I am eyeless, etc., no senses at all belong to Me. And there are the words in the [Mund. Up. (2.1.2)] belonging to the Atharvdveda, "[He is. . .] breathless, mindless, pure."

यत्तावत्स्वाभाविकं परागेवानात्मदर्शनं तदात्मदर्शनस्य प्रतिबन्धकारणमविद्या तत्प्रतिकूलत्वाद्या च परागेवाविद्योपप्रदर्शितेषु दृष्टादृष्टेषु भोगेषु तृष्णा
Kath.Up. 2.1.2 Bh.
Now then, the natural tendency to perceive only outwardly the things that are not the Self, is the cause of obstruction of the vision of the Self and it is ignorance, since it is opposed to that (vision). And there is that thirst for the enjoyment of those very outer things, whether seen or unsee, which are presented by ignorance.

Section 142

References:

अन्नमयादिभ्य आनन्दमयान्तेभ्य आत्मभ्यः अभ्यन्तरतमं ब्रह्म विद्यया प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन दिदर्शयिषु शास्त्रम् अविद्याकृतपञ्चकोशापनयनेन अनेकतुषकोद्रववितुषीकरणेनेव तण्डुलान् प्रस्तौति तस्माद्वा एतस्मादन्नरसमयादित्यादि

Tai.Up. 2.2.1 Bh.

The scripture starts with the text tasmat va etasmat annarasamayat etc., with a view to revealing, through knowledge, **Brahman which is the inmost of all the selves beginning from the physical sheath and ending with the blissful oneas the indwelling Self, by following a process of eliminating the five sheaths** just as rice is extracted from the grain called kodrava that has many husks.

तथा मनुष्याः पशवश्च ये, ते प्राणनकर्मणैव चेष्टावन्तो भवन्ति । अतश्च नान्नमयेनैव परिच्छिन्नात्मना आत्मवन्तः प्राणिनः । किं तर्हि ? तदन्तर्गतप्राणमयेनापि साधारणेनैव सर्वपिण्डव्यापिना आत्मवन्तो मनुष्यादयः । एवं मनोमयादिभिः पूर्वपूर्वव्यापिभिः उत्तरोत्तरैः सूक्ष्मैः आनन्दमयान्तैराकाशादिभूतारब्धैरविद्याकृतैः आत्मवन्तः सर्वे प्राणिनः ।

तथा, स्वाभाविकेनाप्याकाशादिकारणेन नित्येनाविकृतेन सर्वगतेन सत्यज्ञानानन्तलक्षणेन पञ्चकोशातिगेन सर्वात्मना आत्मवन्तः ; स हि परमार्थत आत्मा सर्वेषामित्येतदप्यर्थादुक्तं भवति

Tai.Up. 2.3.1 Bh.

Similarly, those that are human beings and animals, they become active through the function of breathing. Hence, also, it is not simply by possessing the limited self in the form of the body built up by food that creatures become dowered with selves. What then? Human beings and others are endowed with their selves by virtue of possessing a vital body within each physical body, which former is common to, and pervades, each physical body as a whole. Similarly, all creatures are possessed of their selves by virtue of being provided wih the **bodies beginning with the mental and ending with the blissful, which successively pervade the preceding ones and which are made up of the elements counting from akasa that are the creations of ignorance**. So also are they blessed with their selves by the Self that is common to all, selfexistent, the source of space etc., everlasting, unchanging, allpervading, defined as 'truth, knowledge, and infinite', and beyond the five sheaths. And by implication it is also said that this is the Self of all in the real sense.

तदाह यत् यदि एषः आकाशे परमे व्योम्नि गुहायां निहित आनन्दो न स्यात् न भवेत् , को ह्येव लोके अन्यात् अपानचेष्टां कुर्यादित्यर्थः । कः प्राण्यात् प्राणनं वा कुर्यात्

तस्मादस्ति तद्ब्रह्म, यदर्थाः कार्यकरणप्राणनादिचेष्टाः ; तत्कृत एव च आनन्दो लोकस्य

Tai.Up. 2.7.1 Bh.

That fact is being stated: if this Bliss should not be there, in the (supreme) space that is lodged in the cavity of the heart, then in this world, who indeed would inhale, i.e. perform the function of apana; or who would exhale, i.e. perform the function of prana? Therefore, that Brahman, for whose purpose there are such activities of the body and senses, as exhaling etc., does exist; and the happiness of people is caused by That itself.

यत एवम् , तस्मादनिलयनं निलयनं नीड आश्रयः न निलयनम् अनिलयनम् अनाधारं तस्मिन् एतस्मिन् अदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने सर्वकार्यधर्मविलक्षणे ब्रह्मणीति वाक्यार्थः । अभयमिति क्रियाविशेषणम् ।

अभयामिति वा लिङ्गान्तरं परिणम्यते । प्रतिष्ठां स्थितिमात्मभावं विन्दते लभते । अथ तदा सः तस्मिन्नानात्वस्य भयहेतोरविद्याकृतस्यादर्शनादभयं गतो भवति । स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठो ह्यसौ यदा भवति, तदा नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति

Tai.Up. 2.7.1 Bh.

That being so, It is anilayanam: nilayana is a nest, refuge; anilayana is the opposite of that; It is without support. The meaning of the sentence is: (When) in that

entity which is this changeless, unembodied, inexpressible, unsustaining Brahman, which is distinct from all the attributes of a product, (the aspirant) gets stability, Selfabsorption in a fearless way. The word abhayam (fearlessly) is used adverbially (to modify the verb vindate, gets); or it has to be changed in gender to abhayam (fearless) to qualify the noun (pratistham, stability). (When the aspirant gets this fearless stability in Brahman), then, since he does not see diversity which is the creation of ignorance and the cause of fear, therefore, he becomes established in fearlessness. When he becomes established in his true nature, then he does not see anything else, does not hear anything else, does not know anything else.

Section 143

References:

एको हि प्रत्यगात्मा भवति, न द्वौ प्रत्यगात्मानौ सम्भवतः

BSBh. 1.2.20

There could be only one universal Self (Pratyag-ātmā) and there could never be two of that kind

न च एकस्य कार्यकरणसङ्घातस्य द्वावात्मानौ उपपद्येते ; एको हि कार्यकरणसङ्घातः एकेन आत्मना आत्मवान्

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

The same aggregate of body and organs cannot have two selves, for each aggregate possesses a single self.

स हि पुरुषः इह विद्यया आन्तरतमं ब्रह्म सङ्क्रामयितुमिष्टः । तस्य च बाह्याकारविशेषेष्वनात्मसु आत्मभाविताबुद्धिः विना आलम्बनविशेषं कञ्चित् सहसा आन्तरतमप्रत्यगात्मविषया निरालम्बना च कर्तुमशक्येति ।

दृष्टशरीरात्मसामान्यकल्पनया शाखाचन्द्रनिदर्शनवदन्तः प्रवेशयन्नाह

Tai.Up. 2.1.1 Bh.

To make that same man enter into the innermost Brahman by means of knowledge, is what is intended here (i.e. in this II Part). But as regards his intellect that is drawn towards a variety of external objects which are the non-Selves, under the impression that they are the Self, it is not possible, without the aid of some specific object, to make it all at once supportless and absorbed in the thoughts of the Self that is innermost and indwelling. Therefore, as in the illustration in which the moon is pointed out in the direction of the *bow, the sruti, assuming the common identification of the Self with the visible body, and thus leading the intellect still deeper, says

तस्माद्वै एतस्मात् यथोक्तात् अन्नरसमयात्पिण्डात् अन्यः व्यतिरिक्तः अन्तरः अभ्यन्तरः आत्मा पिण्डवदेव मिथ्यापरिकल्पित आत्मत्वेन प्राणमयः, प्राणः वायुः, तन्मयः तत्प्रायः

Tai.Up. 2.2.1 Bh.

As compared with this body made of the essence of food, as described above there is another, separate atma, self which is inside, **(which is) imagined through ignorance to be a self**, just as the physical body is; (which latter self is) pranamayah: prana is air (vital force), and pranamaya means constitued by air, possessed predominantly of air.

परमात्मा, देहादीनां बुद्ध्यन्तानां प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन कल्पितानाम् अविद्यया परमः उपद्रष्टृत्वादिलक्षणः आत्मा इति परमात्मा

BGh. 13.22

He is parama-ātmā, the transcendental Self, because He is the Self which has the characteristics of being **the supreme Witness etc. of (all) those - beginning from the body and ending with the intellect - which are imagined through ignorance** to be the indwelling Self.

रसादयः अन्नरसमयः प्राणमय इत्येवमादयः कोशा इव कोशाः अस्यादेः, उत्तरोत्तरापेक्षया बहिर्भावात्पूर्वपूर्वस्य व्याख्याताः विस्पष्टमाख्याताः तैत्तिरीयके तैत्तिरीयकशाखोपनिषद्वल्ल्याम् , तेषां कोशानामात्मा येनात्मना पञ्चापि कोशा आत्मवन्तोऽन्तरतमेन । स हि सर्वेषां जीवननिमित्तत्वाज्जीवः । कोऽसावित्याह ।

पर एवात्मा यः पूर्वम् 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै। उ। २ । १ । १) इति प्रकृतः ; यस्मादात्मनः स्वप्नमायादिवदाकाशादिक्रमेण रसादयः कोशलक्षणाः सङ्घाता आत्ममायाविसर्जिता इत्युक्तम् । स आत्मा अस्माभिः यथा खं तथेति सम्प्रकाशितः, 'आत्मा ह्याकाशवत्' (मा। का। ३ । ३) इत्यादिश्लोकैः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.11 Bh.

Rasadaya: of the nature of the essence of food, i.e. the sheaths such as those made of food, prana, etc. They are called sheaths since they are like the sheath of a sword, the preceding sheaths being more and more external when compared to those that follow. These have been explained clearly in the Upanishad of the Taittiriya branch. The self, i.e. the individual self of these sheaths, because of which the sheaths themselves become existent, is called Jiva, since it is the source of life. What is it? Answer follows: It is the supreme Self alone that was described earlier as "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait.Up. 2-1). From the Self, like dream or magic sprang up in succession ether etc., through the Maya of the Self. Then (arose) the aggregates of the body in the form of the sheath beginning with that made of food. That Self has been described by us as similar to ether in such verses as, "Self is said to be existing in the form of Jivas just as (the infinite) ether ...." etc. (Man.Up.Ka 3.3).

Section 144

References:

यद्यप्यन्नमयादिभ्य इवानन्दमयात् 'अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा' इति न श्रूयते तथापि नानन्दमयस्य ब्रह्मत्वम् । यत आनन्दमयं प्रकृत्य श्रूयते - 'तस्य प्रियमेव शिरः, मोदो दक्षिणः पक्षः, प्रमोद उत्तरः पक्षः, आनन्द आत्मा, ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा' (तै।उप्। २।५।१) इति । तत्र यद्ब्रह्मेह मन्त्रवर्णे प्रकृतम् 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तैतु।२।१।१) इति, तदिह 'ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा' इत्युच्यते ।
तद्विजिज्ञापयिषयैवान्नमयादय आनन्दमयपर्यन्ताः पञ्च कोशाः कल्प्यन्ते

BSBh. 1.1.19

Even though the scriptures do not speak of any Self still inner than the Ānandamaya, as they do after Annamaya etc. still Ānandamaya could not be Brahman, in as much as, with reference to Ānandamaya the scriptures declare thus – "Joy is its caput, delight the right side, greater delight the left side, Bliss (Ānanda) the Self, and Brahman the tail, the pedestal" (Tai.Up. 2.5). And the same Brahman which is relevant to the Mantra passage – "Truth, Knowledge, and Infinite is Brahman" (Tai.Up. 2.1.1) – is precisely stated here as being "Brahman the tail, the pedestal", and it is **with a desire to impart the knowledge of that, that beginning with Annamaya and ending with Ānandamaya these five sheaths are imagined.**

अपि च ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठेत्युक्त्वेदमुच्यते - 'तदप्येष श्लोको भवति। असन्नेव स भवति। असद्ब्रह्मेति वेद चेत्। अस्ति ब्रह्मेति चेद्वेद। सन्तमेनं ततो विदुः' (तै।उप्। २।६।१) इति। अस्मिंश्च श्लोकेऽननुकृष्यानन्दमयं ब्रह्मण एव भावाभाववेदनयोर्गुणदोषाभिधानाद्गम्यते - 'ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा' इत्यत्र ब्रह्मण एव स्वप्रधानत्वमिति । न चानन्दमयस्यात्मनो भावाभावाशङ्का युक्ता । प्रियमोदादिविशिष्टस्यानन्दमयस्य सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.19

Moreover, in continuation of the mention of "Brahman the tail, the pedestal" it is said – "The verse is sung. The verse is that – He who understands that Brahman is not, himself does not exist, but if he knows that Brahman is, then he is known as existing" (Tai.Up. 2.6.1).
As without bringing up Ānandamaya any further, merit and demerit are mentioned as being the result of knowing Brahman as existing or not existing respectively, we understand that the principal Brahman by itself is mentioned in the sentence – "Brahman the tail, the pedestal".

अन्योऽन्नमयमन्यमुपसङ्क्रामतीति प्रकृत्य मनोमयो विज्ञानमयो वा स्वात्मानमेवोपसङ्क्रामतीति विरोधः स्यात् । तथा न आनन्दमयस्य आत्मसङ्क्रमणमुपपद्यते तस्मात् न प्राप्तिः सङ्क्रमणम् ; नापि अन्नमयादीनामन्यतमकर्तृकं ।

पारिशेष्यादन्नमयाद्यानन्दमयान्तात्मव्यतिरिक्तकर्तृकं ज्ञानमात्रं च सङ्क्रमणमुपपद्यते ।
ज्ञानमात्रत्वे च आनन्दमयान्तःस्थस्यैव सर्वान्तरस्य
आकाशाद्यन्नमयान्तं कार्यं सृष्ट्वा अनुप्रविष्टस्य
हृदयगुहाभिसम्बन्धादन्नमयादिषु अनात्मसु आत्मविभ्रमः
सङ्क्रमणात्मकविवेकविज्ञानोत्पत्त्या विनश्यति ।
तदेतस्मिन्नविद्याविभ्रमनाशे सङ्क्रमणशब्द उपचर्यते

Tai.Up. 2.8.5 Bh.

As a last resort, samkramana can reasonably consist only in the realization by some entity, other than the selves beginning with the foodself and ending with the blissful self. If samkramana means realization alone, then through that samkramana, i.e. through the rise of knowledge about the difference of the Self (from the non-Self), is removed from that allpervasive Self which verily resides within the blissful self and has entered into creation after projecting all things counting from space to food the error of thinking of the non-Selves such as the foodbody as Itself, which (error) arises from Its association with the cavity of the heart. The word samkramana is used figuratively with regard to this eradication of error created by ignorance.

नन्वानन्दमयस्योपसङ्क्रमितव्यस्यान्नमयादिवदब्रह्मत्वे सति नैव विदुषो ब्रह्मप्राप्तिः फलं निर्दिष्टं भवेत् । नैष दोषः । आनन्दमयोपसङ्क्रमणनिर्देशेनैव विदुषः पुच्छप्रतिष्ठाभूतब्रह्मप्राप्तेः फलस्य निर्दिष्टत्वात् । 'तदप्येष श्लोको भवति' 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' इत्यादिना च प्रपञ्च्यमानत्वात्

BSBh. 1.1.19

Objection: But then (says the Vṛtti-kāra), if the Ānandamaya Self which has to be thus abandoned after proper discrimination, were, like the Annamaya etc., not to be Brahman, the scriptures would not mention, that a person who knows thus, attains the fruit viz. the attainment of Brahman.

Reply: This is no fault, because precisely by that very indication about the giving up of Ānandamaya by proper discrimination, the attainment of the fruit viz. Brahman, which is "the tail, the pedestal", also happens to be indicated, and also because of the further elaboration of the same made by the Scriptural passages – "That the verse is sung", and "from which the speech (Vāk) is thrown back" etc.

अपि चानन्दमयस्य ब्रह्मत्वे प्रियाद्यवयवत्वेन सविशेषं ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । निर्विशेषं तु ब्रह्म वाक्यशेषे श्रूयते, वाङ्मनसयोरगोचरत्वाभिधानात् -

'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते। अप्राप्य मनसा सह। आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्। न बिभेति कुतश्चन' (तै।उप्। २।९।१) इति।

BSBh. 1.1.19

Moreover if by Ānandamaya we understand Brahman, we should understand it as Saguṇa (qualified by attributes) Brahman, because it is said to have limbs such as bliss etc. Brahman uncharacterized by any attributes i.e. Nirguṇa Brahman is mentioned in the residuary passage as being unperceivable by speech or the mind in the Scriptural passage – "Unable to attain it (i.e. Brahman), speech along with the mind is turned back. One who has knowledge of the bliss of Brahman, has no fear from any quarter" (Tai.Up. 2.9.1).

Section 145

References:

स्वप्नान्तं स्वप्नमध्यं स्वप्नविज्ञेयमित्येतत् । तथा जागरितान्तं जागरितमध्यं जागरितविज्ञेयं च । उभौ स्वप्नजागरितान्तौ येन आत्मना अनुपश्यति लोकः इति सर्वं पूर्ववत् । तं महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा अवगम्यात्मभावेन साक्षादहमस्मि परमात्मेति धीरः न शोचति

Kath.Up. 2.1.4 Bh.

That the Self through which a man perceives, the content of sleep (dream), i.e. the objects in sleep (dream) similarly, the content of the waking state, the objects in the waking state, both, the sleep (dream) and waking objects. All this is to be explained as before. Realizing;

that great and allpervading Self; having directly known It as identified with oneself thus, 'I am the supreme Self', the wise man, does not grieve.

अत्र एतस्मिन्यथोक्तेऽर्थे एते श्लोका भवन्ति । बहिःप्रज्ञ इति । पर्यायेण त्रिस्थानत्वात् सोऽहमिति स्मृत्या प्रतिसन्धानाच्च स्थानत्रयव्यतिरिक्तत्वमेकत्वं शुद्धत्वमसङ्गत्वं च सिद्धमित्यभिप्रायः, महामत्स्यादिदृष्टान्तश्रुतेः

Ma.Up.Ka. 1.1 Bh.

Here, with regard to the topic already discussed, occur these verses. The drift of this verse is that, since the Self dwells in succession in the three states and since It is being united with memory as, 'That I am', Its distinction from the three states and Its unity, purity and non-attachment become established, as supported by the example of a *large fish (Br.Up. 4.3.18) etc. in the sruti passages.

Section 146

References:

जागरितस्थानो बहिःप्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः स्थूलभुग्वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः

Ma.Up. 3 (sruti)

The first quarter (Pāda) is Vaiśvānara whose sphere (of activity) is the waking state, who is conscious of external objects, who has seven limbs and nineteen mouths and whose experience consists of gross (material) objects.

कथम् 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' इति प्रत्यगात्मनोऽस्य चतुष्पात्त्वे प्रकृते द्युलोकादीनां मूर्धाद्यङ्गत्वमिति ? नैष दोषः, सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात्

Ma.Up. 3. Bh.

Objection: While the subjectmatter under discussion treats of the innermost Self (Pratyak Ātmā) as having four quarters–in the text, "This Atman is Brahman"–how is it that (the external universe consisting of) the effulgent regions, etc., have been described as its limbs such as head, etc.?

Reply: This, however, is no mistake, because the object is to describe the entire phenomena, including those of gods (Adhidaiva) as having four quarters from the standpoint of this Atman known as the Virāt (i.e., the totality of the gross universe).

Section 147

References:

स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः प्रविविक्तभुक्तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः

Ma.Up. 4 (sruti)

The second quarter (Pāda) is the Taijasa whose sphere (of activity) is the dream, who is conscious of internal objects, who has seven limbs and nineteen mouths and who experiences the subtle objects.

सवस्तु संवृतिसता वस्तुना सह वर्तत इति सवस्तु, तथा च उपलब्धिरुपलम्भः, तेन सह वर्तत इति सोपलम्भं च शास्त्रादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदं ग्राह्यग्रहणलक्षणं द्वयं लोकादनपेतं लौकिकं जागरितमित्येतत् । एवंलक्षणं जागरितमिष्यते वेदान्तेषु । अवस्तु संवृतेरप्यभावात् । सोपलम्भं वस्तुवदुपलम्भनमुपलम्भः असत्यपि वस्तुनि, तेन सह वर्तत इति सोपलम्भं च । शुद्धं केवलं प्रविभक्तं जागरितात्स्थूलाल्लौकिकं सर्वप्राणिसाधारणत्वात् इष्यते स्वप्न इत्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.87 Bh.

Savastu: empirical existence, meaning that which exists simultaneously with an object that is real. Similarly, sopalambham means that which exists simultaneously with experience. This duality which is the basis of all activities, scriptural and the rest, and which is

characterised by the subject-object relationship, is the ordinary waking state. The waking state is regarded to be such in the Vedanta-texts. Avastu: objectless, ie. where empirical existence is absent. But like an object it is perceived. Hence it is upalambham. Though there does not exist any object, it appears as though the experience is associated with the object. This state which is pure, which is subtler than the gross waking state, and which is common to all beings, is regarded to be the ordinary dream state.

तथा प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण स्वप्नजागरितयोः न कश्चिद्वस्तुविशेषो गृह्यते ; तस्मात् प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण अभावो युक्तस्तेषाम्

Br.Up. 2.4.7 Bh.

Similarly nothing particular is grasped in the waking and dream states apart from pure Intelligence. Therefore, their non-existence apart from pure intelligence is logical.

गुरुरुवाच -- तह्यर्यागन्तुके त्वेते, न तवात्मभूते। यदि तवात्मभूते चैतन्यस्वरूपवत् स्वतःसिद्धे संतते एव स्याताम्। किंच, स्वप्नजागरिते न तव आत्मभूते, व्यभिचारित्वात् वस्त्रादिवत्। न हि यस्य यत् स्वरूपं तत् तद्व्यभिचारि दृष्टम्। स्वप्नजागरिते तु चैतन्यमात्रत्वात् व्यभिचरतः। सुषुप्ते चेत् स्वरूपं व्यभिचरेत् तत् नष्टं नास्तीति वा

बाध्यमेव स्यात्, आगन्तुकानामतद्धर्माणामुभयात्मकत्वदर्शनात्स्: यथा धनवस्त्रादीनां नाशो दृष्टः, स्वप्नभ्रान्तिलब्धानां तु अभावो दृष्टः

UPS Prose 2.89

The teacher said, they are then adventitious only and are not your own nature. They will surely be continuous if they were self existent like Pure Consciousness which is your own nature. Moreover, they are not your own nature inasmuch as they are non-persistent like clothes and other things. For what is one's own nature is never seen to cease to persist while one is persisting. **But waking and dream cease to persist while Pure Consciousness continues to do so. Pure Consciousness, the Self, persisting in deep sleep,** whatever is non-persistent (at that time) is either destroyed or negated inasmuch as adventitious things, never the properties of one's own nature, are found to possess these characteristics; for example, the destruction of money, clothes, etc., and the negation of things acquired in dream or delusion are seen.

स्वप्नजागरिते स्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।

भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हेतुना

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.5 (Karika)

The thoughtful persons speak of the sameness of the waking and dream states on account of similarity of objects (perceived in both the states) on grounds already described.

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.6 (Karika)

That which is nonexistent at the beginning and in the end, is necessarily so (nonexistent) in the middle. The objects are like the illusions we see, still they are regarded as if real.

सप्रयोजनता तेषां स्वप्ने विप्रतिपद्यते ।

तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.7 (Karika)

The serving a purpose (as means to an end), of them (the objects of waking experience) is contradicted (opposed) in dream. Therefore they are undoubtedly admitted to be illusory on account of their (both waking and dream) being with a beginning and an end.

अपूर्वं स्थानिधर्मो हि यथा स्वर्गनिवासिनाम् ।

तानयं प्रेक्षते गत्वा यथैवेह सुशिक्षितः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.8 (Karika)

The objects (perceived by the dreamer), not usually met with (in the waking state) undoubtedly, owe their existence to the (peculiar) condition in which the cognizer, that is, his mind, works for the time being, as in the case of those residing in heaven. The dreamer associating himself (with the dream conditions) experiences those (objects), even as the one, well-instructed here (goes from one place to another and sees objects belonging to those places).

स्वप्नवृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।

बहिश्चेतो गृहीतं सद्दृष्टं वैतथ्यमेतयोः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.9 (Karika)

In dream, also, what is imagined within by the mind is illusory and what is cognized outside (by the mind) appears to be real. But (in truth) both these are known to be unreal.

जाग्रद्वृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।

बहिश्चेतोगृहीतं सद्युक्तं वैतथ्यमेतयोः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.10 (Karika)

Similarly, in the waking state, also, what is imagined within by the mind is illusory; and what is experienced outside (by the mind) appears to be real. But in fact, both should be rationally held to be unreal.

ग्रहणाज्जागरितवत्तद्धेतुः स्वप्न इष्यते ।

तद्धेतुत्वात्तु तस्यैव सज्जागरितमिष्यते

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.37 (Karika)

As the experience (of objects) in dream is similar to the experience (of objects) in the waking state, therefore it is thought that the waking experiences are the cause of the dreamexperiences. On account of this reason, the waking experiences (supposed to be the cause of the dream) appear as real to the dreamer alone (but not to others).

उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वादजं सर्वमुदाहृतम् ।

न च भूतादभूतस्य सम्भवोऽस्ति कथञ्चन

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.38 (Karika)

All these are known as unborn, as their creation or evolution cannot be established as a fact. It is ever impossible for the unreal to be born of the real.

असज्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा स्वप्ने पश्यति तन्मयः ।

असत्स्वप्नेऽपि दृष्ट्वा च प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.39 (Karika)

Being deeply impressed with the (reality of the) unreal objects which a man sees in the waking state, he sees those very things in dream as well. Moreover, the unreal objects cognised in the dream are not seen again in the waking state.

यथा स्वप्नः स्वप्नदृश एव सन् साधारणविद्यमानवस्तुवदवभासते, तथा तत्कारणत्वात्साधारणविद्यमानवस्तुवदवभासनम् , न तु साधारणं विद्यमानवस्तु स्वप्नवदेवेत्यभिप्रायः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.37 Bh.

Just as dream appears to be real to the dreamer alone, like any other object existing in the ordinary course, similarly, the waking state, since it is the cause of dream, appearse like any other objects, existing in the ordinary course, but the things that really exist in the ordinary course are not like those in dream. This is the idea.

Section 148

References:

ननु जागरितं प्रबोधरूपत्वान्न स्वप्नः । नैवम् ; स्वप्न एव । कथम् ? परमार्थस्वात्मप्रबोधाभावात् स्वप्नवदसद्वस्तुदर्शनाच्च

Ait.Up. 1.3.12 Bh.

Objection: The waking state is not a dream, it being a state of consciousness.
Answer: Not so, it is verily a dream.
Objection: How?
Answer: Since there is no consciousness of one's own supreme Self, and in it are perceived unreal things as in a dream.

जाग्रत्प्रज्ञा अनेकसाधना बहिर्विषयेवावभासमाना मनःस्पन्दनमात्रा सती तथाभूतं संस्कारं मनस्याधत्ते ; तन्मनः तथा संस्कृतं चित्रित इव पटो बाह्यसाधनानपेक्षमविद्याकामकर्मभिः प्रेर्यमाणं जाग्रद्वदवभासते

Ma.Up. 4 Bh.

The consciousnsss during the waking state associate with many means and possessed of the naturs of mental vibration, appears as though associated with the external objects and creates corresponding impressions in the mind. The mind thus endowed with the impressions, like a canvas with painting appears (in the state of dream)

just as in the waking state, without depending on any external means, impelled by ignorance, desire and action.

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया । तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया । अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं चित्तं स्वप्ने न संशयः । अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.61-62 (Karika)

As in dream, the mind is seen to act through Māyā manifesting the appearance of duality, so also in the waking state the mind is seen to act, through Māyā, producing the appearance of duality.

स्वप्नदृक्प्रचरन्स्वप्ने दिक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।
अण्डजान्स्वेदजान्वापि जीवान्पश्यति यान्सदा

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.63 (Karika)

The whole variety of Jīvas, born of eggs, moisture, etc., always seen by the dreamer when he goes about (in his dream) in all ten directions (have no existence apart from the mind of the dreamer).

स्वप्नदृक्चित्तदृश्यास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।
तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं स्वप्नदृक्चित्तमिष्यते

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.64 (Karika)

These (beings) which are objects of the mind of the dreamer have no existence apart from his mind (consciousness). Similarly, this mind of the dreamer is admitted being the object of perception of the dreamer

only. (Therefore, the mind of the dreamer is not separate from the dreamer himself).

चरञ्जागरिते जाग्रद्दिक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।
अण्डजान्स्वेदजान्वापि जीवान्पश्यति यान्सदा
जाग्रच्चित्तेक्षणीयास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।
तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं जाग्रतश्चित्तमिष्यते
Ma.Up.Ka. 4.65-66 (Karika)

The whole variety of Jīvas, born of eggs, moisture, etc., always seen by the waking man when he goes about (in his waking condition) in all ten directions, is only the object of the mind (consciousness) of the waking man. These Jīvas are in no way apart from the waking mind (consciousness). Similarly, the mind of the waking man is admitted being the object of perception of the waking person only. (Therefore, the mind is not separate from the perceiver.)

जाग्रतो दृश्या जीवाः तच्चित्ताव्यतिरिक्ताः, चित्तेक्षणीयत्वात् ,
स्वप्नदृक्चित्तेक्षणीयजीववत् । तच्च जीवेक्षणात्मकं चित्तं
द्रष्टुरव्यतिरिक्तं द्रष्टृदृश्यत्वात् स्वप्नचित्तवत्
Ma.Up.Ka. 4.66 Bh.

The creatures that are visible to the man in the waking state are not different from his consciousness, inasmuch as they are seen through consciousness, as is the case with creatures seen by the consciousness of a dreamer. And that consciousness that observes the creatures is

nondifferent from the experiencer, since it is observed by the experiencer, as is the case with the consciousness in the dream state.

Section 149

References:

अत्रोच्यते - न स्वप्नादिप्रत्ययवज्जाग्रत्प्रत्यया भवितुमर्हन्ति । कस्मात् ? वैधर्म्यात् - वैधर्म्यं हि भवति स्वप्नजागरितयोः । किं पुनर्वैधर्म्यम् ? बाधाबाधाविति ब्रूमः - बाध्यते हि स्वप्नोपलब्धं वस्तु प्रतिबुद्धस्य - मिथ्या मयोपलब्धो महाजनसमागम इति, न ह्यस्ति मम महाजनसमागमः, निद्राग्लानं तु मे मनो बभूव, तेनैषा भ्रान्तिरुद्बभूवेति । एवं मायादिष्वपि भवति यथायथं बाधः । नैवं जागरितोपलब्धं वस्तु स्तम्भादिकं कस्याञ्चिदप्यवस्थायां बाध्यते

BSBh. 2.2.29

It is said with regard to this – Perceptions during waking state do not deserve to be like the perceptions in a dream etc. Why (is it) so? Because of the dissimilarity in their nature**. Dream-state and waking-state are dissimilar**. What dissimilarity is there?

Reply: That it consists in the subsequent contradiction, and the absence of such subsequent contradiction respectively. **Things perceived in a dream by a person**

are contradicted on his awakening (from a dream), (for he says) – 'Oh, I wrongly fancied I was in the company of a great person, I did not in fact meet him, my mind was overcome with sleep, and this caused the illusion.' There is a similar contradiction in the case of Māyā (illusion) etc. But a thing perceived in a waking condition – a pillar for instance – is never contradicted under any circumstances.

अपि च स्मृतिरेषा, यत्स्वप्नदर्शनम् । उपलब्धिस्तु जागरितदर्शनम् । स्मृत्युपलब्ध्योश्च प्रत्यक्षमन्तरं स्वयमनुभूयते
अर्थविप्रयोगसम्प्रयोगात्मकम् - इष्टं पुत्रं स्मरामि, नोपलभे, उपलब्धुमिच्छामीति । तत्रैवं सति न शक्यते वक्तुम् -

मिथ्या जागरितोपलब्धिः, उपलब्धित्वात्, स्वप्नोपलब्धिवदिति -

उभयोरन्तरं स्वयमनुभवता । न च स्वानुभवापलापः प्राज्ञमानिभिर्युक्तः कर्तुम्

BSBh. 2.2.29

Besides, dream experience is of course a mere remembrance or memory (of past impressions), while what is seen during waking condition, is a perception or experience (brought about, by the operation of the means-of-proof). The actual distinction between remembrance or memory (in a dream) and perception or experience (in a waking condition) which is of the nature

of separation from or contact with a thing, is directly experienced by a person himself, when he says, for instance, 'I remember my dear son, but I am not able to see him. But I do wish to see him.' Under these circumstances, a **person who himself actually experiences the difference between them, cannot say that waking perceptions are unreal, because of their actual perception by him, merely because they are perceptions similar to perceptions during dreams.**
It is not proper or logical for persons who claim to be intelligent, to deny the truth of their own experience.

अपि च अनुभवविरोधप्रसङ्गात् । जागरितप्रत्ययानां स्वतो निरालम्बनतां वक्तुमशक्नुवता । स्वप्नप्रत्ययसाधर्म्याद्वक्तुमिष्यते । न च, यो यस्य स्वतो धर्मो न सम्भवति सोऽन्यस्य साधर्म्यात्तस्य सम्भविष्यति । न ह्यग्निरुष्णोऽनुभूयमान उदकसाधर्म्याच्छीतो भविष्यति । दर्शितं तु वैधर्म्यं स्वप्नजागरितयोः

BSBh. 2.2.29

Besides, lest there may be the predicament of having to contradict their own experience, those who are unable to say, that waking perceptions are without any support, wish to say so, on the ground of their similarity to dream perceptions, that, which cannot possibly be the nature of a particular thing, can never be its nature merely because

of its similarity with some other things. Fire (for instance) which is experienced to be hot, will never become a cold entity merely because of its similarity to water (merely because both are entities). The dissimilarity between the natures of cognitions in a dream condition and of those in a waking condition has already been indicated.

स्वप्नजागरिते स्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।

भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हेतुना

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.5 (Karika)

The thoughtful persons speak of the sameness of the waking and dream states on account of similarity of objects (perceived in both the states) on grounds already described.

उभयोरपि वैतथ्यं भेदानां स्थानयोर्यदि ।

क एतान्बुध्यते भेदान्को वै तेषां विकल्पकः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.11 (Karika)

If the objects cognized in both the conditions (of dream and of waking) be illusory, who cognizes all these (illusory objects) and who again imagines them?

कल्पयत्यात्मनात्मानमात्मा देवः स्वमायया ।

स एव बुध्यते भेदानिति वेदान्तनिश्चयः

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.12 (Karika)

Ātman, the selfluminous, through the power of his own Māyā, imagines in himself by himself (all the objects that the subject experiences within or without). He alone is the cognizer of the objects (so created). This is the decision of the Vedānta.

Section 150

References:

उद्दालको हारुणिः श्वेतकेतुं पुत्रमुवाच स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य विजानीहीति यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवति स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति

Chand.Up. 6.8.1 (sruti)

Uddālaka Āruṇi said to his son Śvetaketu: 'O Somya, let me explain to you the concept of deep sleep. When a person is said to be sleeping, O Somya, he becomes one with Sat [Existence], and he attains his real Self. That is why people say about him, "He is sleeping." He is then in his Self'.

तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दा अपहतपाप्माभयं रूपम् । तद्यथा प्रियया स्त्रिया सम्परिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरमेवमेवायं पुरुषः प्राज्ञेनात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरं तद्वा अस्यैतदाप्तकाममात्मकाममकामं रूपं शोकान्तरम्

Br.Up. 4.3.21 (sruti)

That is his form–beyond desires, free from evils, and fearless. As a man, fully embraced by his beloved wife, does not know anything at all, either external or internal, so does this infinite being (self), fully embraced by the Supreme Self, not know anything at all, either external or internal. That is his form–in which all objects of desire have been attained and are but the self, and which is free from desires and devoid of grief.

यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति तत्सुषुप्तम् । सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक्चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञस्तृतीयः पादः

Ma.Up. 5 (sruti)

That is the state of deep sleep wherein the sleeper does not desire any objects, nor does he see any dream. The third quarter (Pāda) is the Prājña whose sphere is deep sleep, in whom all (experiences) become unified or undifferentiated, who is verily, a mass of consciousness entire, who is full of bliss and who experiences bliss, and who is the path leading to the knowledge (of the two other states).

Section 151

References:

एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि भूतानाम्

Ma.Up. 6 (sruti)

This is the Lord of all; this is the knower of all; this is the controller within; this is the source of all; and this is that from which all things originate and in which they finally disappear.

सुषुप्ताव्याकृतयोस्त्वेकत्वं सिद्धमेव, निर्विशेषत्वात्

Ma.Up. 3 Bh.

It is an established fact that the Self in deep sleep (Prajna) is identical with the Unmanifested (Isvara) because of the absence of any distinction between them.

न हि प्रागुत्पत्तेः नामवद्रूपवद्वा इदमिति ग्रहीतुं शक्यं वस्तु सुषुप्तकाले इव । यथा सुषुप्तादुत्थितः सत्त्वमात्रमवगच्छति सुषुप्ते सन्मात्रमेव केवलं वस्त्विति, तथा प्रागुत्पत्तेरित्यभिप्रायः

Chand.Up. 6.2.1 Bh.

For, as is deep sleep, so also before creation it was not possible to grasp this as possessed of name of form. As someone, after rising from deep sleep, realizes that is deep sleep the thing that existed was mere existence, i.e. he realizes existence alone, similar was the case before creation. This is the meaning.

तथा तृतीयेऽपि पर्याये - 'नाह खल्वयमेवं सम्प्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मीति नो एवेमानि भूतानि' इति सुषुप्तावस्थायां विशेषविज्ञानाभावमेव दर्शयति। न विज्ञातारं प्रतिषेधति । यत्तु तत्र 'विनाशमेवापीतो भवति' इति, तदपि विशेषविज्ञानविनाशाभिप्रायमेव । न विज्ञातृविनाशाभिप्रायम् । 'न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वात्' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।३।३०) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात्

BSBh. 1.1.19

So also in the third chapter, Prajā-pati merely indicates that there is absence of any special cognition during sleep, by the passage "He verily does not know himself as himself, nor these beings" (Chan.Up. 8.12.1). But he does not deny the existence of (himself) as the cognizer. Now what is said there, viz., "He has gone into utter annihilation" (Chan.Up. 8.12.2) is also meant to convey the annihilation of the special cognition only and not meant to convey the utter annihilation of the cognizer. Because of another Scriptural passage as follows: – "There is no annihilation of the cognition of the cognizer, precisely because of the indestructibility (of cognition)" (Br.Up. 4.3.30).

तत्र सति सम्पन्नस्तावत् एकत्वात् न विजानातीति युक्तम्

BSBh. 3.2.7

Therefore, it is logical that (the Jīva-Self) which has attained oneness with the 'Sat' does not cognize (anything).

यद्धि तद्विशेषदर्शनकारणमन्तःकरणम् चक्षू रूपं च, तत् अविद्यया अन्यत्वेन प्रत्युपस्थापितमासीत् । तत् एतस्मिन्काले एकीभूतम् , आत्मनः परेण परिष्वङ्गात् । द्रष्टुर्हि परिच्छिन्नस्य विशेषदर्शनाय करणम् अन्यत्वेन व्यवतिष्ठते ; अयं तु स्वेन सर्वात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तः – स्वेन परेण प्राज्ञेन आत्मना, प्रिययेव पुरुषः । तेन न पृथक्त्वेन व्यवस्थितानि करणानि, विषयाश्च ; तदभावात् विशेषदर्शनं नास्ति ; करणादिकृतं हि तत् , न आत्मकृतम् ; आत्मकृतमिव प्रत्यवभासते । तस्मात् तत्कृता इयं भ्रान्तिः – आत्मनो दृष्टिः परिलुप्यते इति

Br.Up. 4.3.23 Bh.

That which formed the cause of the particular vision, viz the mind assuming the role of the eye, was presented by ignorance in a different form. That has become unified in this state (of deep sleep), on account of the embrace of the individual self with the Supreme Self. When the seer (Self) is in contact with adjuncts, the senses remain in a different form in order to help it to have distinct experience. But this (individual) self is embraced by the supreme Self, the Self of all, called "Prajna, as a man is

by his dear wife. Hence the organs and objects do not stand as different entities; and since they are absent, there is no particular experience, for it is the product of the organs etc., not of the self, and only appears as the product of the self. **Therefore it is a mistake due to this (absence of particular experience) that the vision of the self is lost.**

Section 152

References:

सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति । परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा

BSBh. 1.4.18

During the period of deep sleep, moreover, the Jīva-Self becomes one with the Highest Brahman. All Vedāntas culminate in inculcating that all this transitory world of Prāṇa etc. originates from the Highest Brahman.

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति । स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात् । स्वप्नजागरितयोः तूपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य । तदुपशमात्सुषुप्तेः स्वरूपापत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते - 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति

BSBh. 3.2.7

Besides, it is not, that **the Jīva-Self is ever not-one-with-Brahman**, because its own real nature is imperishable. It is with reference to the Self's having, as it were, acquired a foreign nature as a result of its contact with **limiting adjuncts during the conditions of dreams and wakefulness, that it is said, that, when during deep sleep, these limiting adjuncts are relaxed, it acquires its own true nature.**

तथापि जीवप्रसवबीजात्मकत्वमपरित्यज्यैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतः सच्छब्दवाच्यता च । यदि हि निर्बीजरूपं विवक्षितं ब्रह्माभविष्यत् , 'नेति नेति' (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । ३) 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' (तै। उ। २ । ९ । १) 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' (के। उ। १ । ४) इत्यवक्ष्यत् ; 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' (भ। गी। १३ । १२) इति स्मृतेः

Ma.Up.Ka 1.2 Bh.

Though Sat, i.e., Brahman, is indicated in that passage by the word 'Prana', yet the Brahman that is indicated by the words Sat and Prana (in that connection) is not the one who is free from its attribute of being the seed or cause that creates all beings. For if in that Śruti passage, Brahman, devoid of the causal relation (i.e., the Absolute) were sought to be described, then the Śruti would have used such expressions as "Not this, Not this," "Wherefrom speech turns back", "That is something other than both the known and the unknown", etc. The Smṛti also

declares, “It is neither Sat (existence) nor Asat (nonexistence)” (Gītā).

बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिस्थानविशेष-योगाद् उद्भूतस्य विशेषविज्ञानस्य उपाध्युपशमे य उपशमः । स परमात्मना सम्बन्धः - इत्युपाध्यपेक्षया उपचर्यते

BSBh. 3.2.34

The destruction (Upaśama) of a particular special cognition of difference arising from the contact of the Jīva-Self with special environments in the form of limiting adjuncts such as intelligence (Buddhi) etc., which results from the destruction of that particular limiting adjunct, and is spoken of with reference to that limiting adjunct, is what is **metaphorically meant to be the relation i.e. connection of the Jīva-Self to the Highest Self.**

[Supplement]

तथा भेदव्यपदेशोऽपि ब्रह्मण उपाधिभेदापेक्षयैव उपचर्यते । न स्वरूपभेदापेक्षया

BSBh. 3.2.34

Similarly, the reference to **‘difference’ is also a metaphorical statement about a difference in Brahman in connection with limiting adjuncts** and is not in connection with any difference in its nature as such.

उपपद्यते च अत्र ईदृश एव सम्बन्धः, नान्यादृशः - 'स्वमपीतो भवति' (छन्।उप्। ६।८।१) इति हि स्वरूपसम्बन्धम् एनमामनन्ति; स्वरूपस्य च अनपायित्वात् । न नर-नगर-न्यायेन सम्बन्धो घटते

BSBh. 3.2.35

And it is only thus and in no other way that a 'relation i.e. connection' becomes reasonably sustainable, because the scriptures declare such a relation with its own nature, thus – "He becomes one with his own Self" (Chan.Up. 6.8.1), as the Self's own nature is imperishable. A relation, in accordance with the maxim of 'a citizen and a city', does not fit in properly.

त्रय आवसथाः – जागरितकाले इन्द्रियस्थानं दक्षिणं चक्षुः, स्वप्नकाले अन्तर्मनः, सुषुप्तिकाले हृदयाकाश इत्येते ; वक्ष्यमाणा वा त्रय आवसथाः – पितृशरीरं मातृगर्भाशयः स्वं च शरीरमिति । त्रयः स्वप्ना जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्त्याख्याः

Ait.Up. 1.3.12 Bh.

there are three abodes (traya āvasathāḥ) viz the right eye, the seat of the sense (of vision), during the waking state; the mind inside, during the dream state; and the space within the heart, during the state of deep sleep. Or the three abodes may be the ones that will be enumerated, viz the body of the father, the womb of the mother, and one's own body. (He has), three (states of) dream, known as waking, dream, and deep sleep.

द्वैतस्याग्रहणं तुल्यमुभयोः प्राज्ञतुर्ययोः ।
बीजनिद्रायुतः प्राज्ञः सा च तुर्ये न विद्यते

Ma.Up.Ka. 1.13 (Karika)

The noncognition of duality is common to both Prājña and Turīya. (But) Prājña is associated with sleep in the form of cause, and this (sleep) does not exist in Turīya.

नान्तःप्रज्ञं नबहिःप्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं नप्रज्ञानघनं नप्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञम् ।
अदृश्यमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणमचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं
प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः

Ma.Up. 7 (sruti)

Turīya is not that which is conscious of the internal (subjective) world, nor that which is conscious of the external (objective) world, nor that which is conscious of both, nor that which is a mass all sentiency, nor that which is simple consciousness, nor that which is insentient. (It is) unseen (by any sense organ), not related to anything, incomprehensible (by the mind), uninferable, unthinkable, indescribable, essentially of the nature of Consciousness constituting the Self alone, negation of all phenomena, the Peaceful, all Bliss and the Nondual. This is what is known as the fourth (Turīya). This is the Ātman and it has to be realised.

यतः अद्वैतं भेदविकल्परहितं चतुर्थं तुरीयं मन्यन्ते, प्रतीयमानपादत्रयरूपवैलक्षण्यात्

Ma.Up. 7 Bh.

As it is nondual, i.e., devoid of illusory ideas of distinction, therefore it is called **"Turiya", the "Fourth", because it is totally distinct (in character) from the three quarters which are mere appearances.**

Section 153

References:

अभिधानाभिधेययोरेकत्वेऽपि अभिधानप्राधान्येन निर्देशः कृतः 'ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वम्' इत्यादि । अभिधानप्राधान्येन निर्दिष्टस्य पुनरभिधेयप्राधान्येन निर्देशः अभिधानाभिधेययोरेकत्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्थः । इतरथा हि अभिधानतन्त्राभिधेयप्रतिपत्तिरिति अभिधेयस्याभिधानत्वं गौणमित्याशङ्का स्यात् । एकत्वप्रतिपत्तेश्च प्रयोजनमभिधानाभिधेययोः – एकेनैव प्रयत्नेन युगपत्प्रविलापयंस्तद्विलक्षणं ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्येतेति । तथा च वक्ष्यति – 'पादा मात्रा मात्राश्च पादाः' (मा। उ। ८) इति

Ma.Up.2 Bh.

Though the name and the object expressed by it are same, it is after attributing greater importance to the name that it is said, "All this is the letter Om' etc. After presenting the name with 'greater importance, the object designated by it too is presented with due stress, for the

comprehension of the unity of the name and the object expressed. Otherwise, doubt may arise whether the statement that the name and the object denoted by it are the same, is expressed in a secondary sense, since the object denoted is grasped as dependant on the name. And the object of apprehension of the unity (of both these) is to eliminate both the name and the object denoted with the same effort to attain Brahman that is distinct from these. And so shall be said later on (regarding the unity of both) in words such as "The quarters are the syllables, and the syllables are the quarters" (Mand.Up. 8)

रज्ज्वादिरिव सर्पादिविकल्पस्यास्पदमद्वय आत्मा परमार्थतः सन्प्राणादिविकल्पस्यास्पदं यथा, तथा सर्वोऽपि वाक्प्रपञ्चः प्राणाद्यात्मविकल्पविषय ओङ्कार एव । स चात्मस्वरूपमेव, तदभिधायकत्वात् । ओङ्कारविकारशब्दाभिधेयश्च सर्वः प्राणादिरात्मविकल्पः अभिधानव्यतिरेकेण नास्ति ; 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम्' (छा। उ। ६ । १ । ४) 'तदस्येदं वाचा तन्त्या नामभिर्दामभिः सर्वं सितम् , सर्वं हीदं नामनि' (ऐ। आ। २ । १ । ६) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

Ma.Up.1 Bh.

As the rope, etc., which are the substratum of such illusions (misapprehensions) as the snake, etc., so is the

nondual Atman, which is the Ultimate Reality, the substratum of such imaginations as the vital breath (Prana), etc., which are unreal. Similarly, Aum is the substratum of the entire illusion of the world of speech having for its (corresponding) contents such illusory objects as Prana, etc., imagined in Atman. And Aum is verily of the same essential character as the Atman; for it is the name for Atman. All illusions such as Prana, etc., having Atman for their substratum and denoted by words– which are but modifications of Aum–, cannot exist without names (which are but the modification of Aum). This is supported by such Śruti passages as: "The modification being only a name arising from speech." "All this related to It (Brahman) is held together by the cord of speech, and strands of (specific) names." "All these (are rendered possible in experience) by names," etc.

अमात्रश्चतुर्थोऽव्यवहार्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत एवमोङ्कार आत्मैव संविशत्यात्मनात्मानं य एवं वेद

Ma.Up. 12 (sruti)

That which has no parts (soundless), incomprehensible (with the aid of the senses), the cessation of all phenomena, all bliss and **nondual Aum, is the fourth and verily the same as the Ātman.** He who knows this merges his self in the Self.

अमात्रः मात्रा यस्य न सन्ति, सः अमात्रः ओङ्कारः चतुर्थः तुरीयः आत्मैव केवलः अभिधानाभिधेयरूपयोर्वाङ्मनसयोः क्षीणत्वात् अव्यवहार्यः ।

प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवः अद्वैतः संवृत्तः एवं यथोक्तविज्ञानवता प्रयुक्त ओङ्कारस्त्रिमात्रस्त्रिपाद आत्मैव ; संविशति आत्मना स्वेनैव स्वं पारमार्थिकमात्मानम् , य एवं वेद ; परमार्थदर्शनात् ब्रह्मवित् तृतीयं बीजभावं दग्ध्वा आत्मानं प्रविष्ट इति । न पुनर्जायते, तुरीयस्याबीजत्वात् ।

न हि रज्जुसर्पयोर्विवेके रज्ज्वां प्रविष्टः सर्पः बुद्धिसंस्कारात्पुनः पूर्ववत्तद्विवेकिनामुत्थास्यति

Ma.Up. 12 Bh.

Amatra: that which has no matra (part). That partless Om, the Fourth, is Turiya, the absolute Self, beyond comprehension through ordinary means, owing to the annihilation of speech and mind which are the forms of names and the objects indcated. It is the final limit of the negation of the world, the auspicious and the non-dual. Om, as endowed with the three letters and as used by one with the knowledge spoken of above, is the Self Itself endowed with three quarters. He who knows thus, enters into his own supreme Self. He, the knower of Brahman, who has perceived the supreme Reality, has entered into Self by destroying (burning) the third causal state. Therefore, he is not born again, for Turiya consists

of no causal state. For, the illusory snake which has merged in the rope on the discrimination of the snake from the rope, does not reappear as before, to those who know the distinction between them, by any effort of the mind (due to the previous impressions).

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमनामकमरूपकम् । सकृद्विभातं सर्वज्ञं नोपचारः कथञ्चन

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.36 (Karika)

(This Brahman is) birthless, free from sleep and dream, without name and form, evereffulgent and omniscient. Nothing has to be done in any way (with respect to Brahman).

सर्वाभिलापविगतः सर्वचिन्तासमुत्थितः । सुप्रशान्तः सकृज्ज्योतिः समाधिरचलोऽभयः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.37 (Karika)

(This Ātman is) beyond all expression by words beyond all acts of mind; (It is) all peace, eternal effulgence free from activity and fear and attainable by concentrated understanding (of the Jīva).

Supplement regarding Samadhi:

समाधिः समाधिनिमित्तप्रज्ञावगम्यत्वात् ; समाधीयते अस्मिन्निति वा समाधिः

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.37 Bh.

Samadhih: (divinely) absorbed, meaning It is knowable through the awareness developed through samadhi (which is high state of concentration). It is called samadhi also because the mind is concentrated on It.

Section 154

References:

योऽत्र अभिनिष्पद्यत इत्युक्तः । स सर्वबन्ध-विनिर्मुक्तः शुद्धेनैव आत्मना अवतिष्ठते । पूर्वत्र तु - 'अन्धो भवति' 'अपि रोदितीव' 'विनाशमेवापीतो भवति' - इति च

अवस्थात्रय-कलुषितेन आत्मना - इत्ययं विशेषः

BSBh. 4.4.2

That (Jīva-Self) which is here spoken of, as manifesting itself (in its own Ātmā form), is one, that now is released from all bondage, and which subsists as its own pure Self. The special distinction being, that before, its Ātmā-Self was obscured by the three conditions, referred to in the Scriptural passage – "He happens to become blind, he weeps as it were, and is, as it were, destroyed" (Chan.Up. 8.9.10-11, in which Indra points out these defects in the Self as taught him by Prajāpati).

फलत्व-प्रसिद्धिरपि मोक्षस्य बन्ध-निवृत्तिमात्रापेक्षा । न अपूर्वोपजनापेक्षा

BSBh. 4.4.2

Besides, **liberation which is known to be the fruit, is dependent upon merely the cessation from bondage and not on the accrual of some extraordinary new condition altogether.**

Section 155

References:

यथा शुद्धस्य स्फटिकस्य स्वाच्छ्यं शौक्ल्यं च स्वरूपं प्राग्विवेकग्रहणाद्रक्तनीलाद्युपाधिभिरविविक्तमिव भवति । प्रमाणजनितविवेकग्रहणात्तु पराचीनः स्फटिकः स्वाच्छ्येन शौक्ल्येन च स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यत इत्युच्यते प्रागपि तथैव सन् । तथा देहाद्युपाध्यविविक्तस्यैव सतो जीवस्य श्रुतिकृतं विवेकविज्ञानं शरीरात्समुत्थानम् । विवेकविज्ञानफलं स्वरूपेणाभिनिष्पत्तिः केवलात्मस्वरूपावगतिः

BSBh. 1.3.19

Just as the nature of a pure crystal, viz. its purity and whiteness, is undistinguishable as it were, on account of such limiting adjuncts as redness and blueness, prior to its being understood with proper discrimination, but after it

is so understood with proper discrimination resulting from Pramāṇa i.e. means-of-proof, the crystal, so understood afterwards, is said to appear in its own nature of purity and whiteness, even though it was the same crystal even before. Similarly, the discriminating cognition by the Jīva-Self produced in it by the scriptures, undiscriminated as it is on account of the limiting adjuncts of the body etc., is just 'this rising from the body', **and the fruit of such proper discrimination is in its becoming manifest in its own nature, and in its realization of its nature as the pure (Kevala) Self**.

एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः - केवलेनैव आत्मना आविर्भवति । न धर्मान्तरेणेति । कुतः? 'स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते' इति स्व-शब्दात् । अन्यथा हि स्व-शब्देन विशेषणम् अनवक्लृप्तं स्यात् । ननु, आत्मीयाभिप्रायः स्व-शब्दो भविष्यति - न, तस्यावचनीयत्वात् । येनैव हि केनचिद्रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते, तस्यैव आत्मीयत्वोपपत्तेः । स्वेनेति विशेषणमनर्थकं स्यात् । आत्म-वचनतायां तु अर्थवत् - केवलेनैव आत्मरूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते । न आगन्तुकेनापररूपेणापीति
BSBh. 4.4.1

This being the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta), Reply: **It manifests itself in the pure form of its own Self, and not in some other adventitious form.** Whence is it so? Because of the word 'Sva' (one's own) in the scriptural statement – "It manifests itself in its own Ātmā

form", otherwise, the special qualifying adjective 'Sva' (one's own) would not be appropriate.
Opponent: But word 'Sva' may merely convey the meaning of the form of the Self.
Reply: No, because it is not necessary to say so in so many words, inasmuch as it is reasonably sustainable that whatever particular form any thing manifests itself in, it, all the same, is its own form and therefore (in that case) the qualifying word 'Sva' would be meaningless but if the word is construed to mean the Self (Ātmā), the qualifying word has a meaning. In as much as the Jīva-Self manifests itself purely as its own Ātmā-Self and not in some other adventitious form.

यदपि अभिनिष्पद्यत इत्युत्पत्ति-पर्यायत्वम् । तदपि न अपूर्वावस्थापेक्षम् -
यथा रोग-निवृत्तौ अरोगोऽभिनिष्पद्यत इति, तद्वत्
BSBh. 4.4.2
As regards the argument (of the opponent of Vedānta) that 'to be manifest' is synonymous with 'to be born', that also, is with reference to the earlier condition (of the Jīva-Self), even as a person, who, after being cured of his malady, emerges from it (i.e. out of the illness), is a person who now is free from such malady.

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः । न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.32 (Karika)

There is no dissolution, no birth, none in bondage, none aspiring for wisdom, no seeker of liberation and none liberated. This is the absolute truth.

यदा वितथं द्वैतम् आत्मैवैकः परमार्थतः सन् , तदा इदं निष्पन्नं भवति – सर्वोऽयं लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारोऽविद्याविषय एवेति

Ma.Up.Ka. 2.32 Bh.

When duality is perceived to be illusory and Atman alone is known as the sole Reality, then it is clearly established that all our experiences, ordinary or religious (Vedic), verily pertain to the domain of ignorance.

Section 156

References:

मोक्षस्य इदानीमिव निर्विशेषत्वे तदर्थाधिकयत्नानुपपत्तिः शास्त्रवैयर्थ्यं च प्राप्नोतीति चेत् । न, अविद्याभ्रमापोहार्थत्वात् ; न हि वस्तुतो मुक्तामुक्तत्वविशेषोऽस्ति, आत्मनो नित्यैकरूपत्वात् ; किन्तु तद्विषया

अविद्या अपोह्यते शास्त्रोपदेशजनितविज्ञानेन ; प्राक्तदुपदेशप्राप्तेः तदर्थश्च प्रयत्न उपपद्यत एव

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: If liberation makes no difference from the present state, it is unreasonable to make a particular effort for it, and the scriptures too become useless.

Reply: **No, for both are necessary to remove the delusion created by ignorance**. **Really there is no such distinction as liberation and bondage in the self, for it is eternally the same**; **but the ignorance regarding it is removed by the knowledge arising from the teachings of the scriptures, and prior to the receiving of these teachings, the effort to attain liberation is perfectly reasonable**.

न चाविद्यावत्त्वे तदपगमे च वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषोऽस्ति । यथा कश्चित्संतमसे पतितां काञ्चिद्रज्जुमहिं मन्यमानो भीतो वेपमानः पलायते । तं चापरो ब्रूयात् 'मा भैषीः नायमहिः रज्जुरेव' इति । स च तदुपश्रुत्याहिकृतं भयमुत्सृजेद्वेपथुं पलायनं च । न त्वहिबुद्धिकाले तदपगमकाले च ।

वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषः स्यात् - तथैवैतदपि द्रष्टव्यम्

BSBh. 1.4.6

Both during such influence and after it is removed, the entity (i.e. the Self) is the same all through and not different. Just as a man mistaking a rope lying about in semi-darkness to be a snake, is frightened and tremblingly runs away, but when another person assures him that it is merely a rope and not a snake, and that he should not be frightened, overcomes his own fear on hearing so and ceases to tremble and to run away, while both during the time he wrongly fancied the rope to be a snake, and after his mistaken notion about it is removed, **the thing (the rope) was the same all through and without any difference**, so should this be understood

अविद्यावतः अविद्यानिवृत्त्यनिवृत्तिकृतः विशेषः आत्मनः स्यादिति चेत् न, अविद्याकल्पनाविषयत्वाभ्युपगमात् , रज्जूषरशुक्तिकागगनानां सर्पोदकरजतमलिनत्वादिवत् , अदोष इत्यवोचाम ।

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: There will be some difference in the self that is under ignorance, due to the cessation or continuance of that ignorance.

Reply: No; we have already said that **it is admitted being the creation of ignorance**, like a rope, a desert, a motherofpearl and the sky appearing as a snake, water, silver, and blue respectively.

तिमिरातिमिरदृष्टिवत् अविद्याकर्तृत्वाकर्तृत्वकृत आत्मनो विशेषः स्यादिति चेत् ।

न, 'ध्यायतीव लेलायतीवऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ७) इति स्वतः अविद्याकर्तृत्वस्य प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् ; अनेकव्यापारसन्निपातजनितत्वाच्च अविद्याभ्रमस्य ; विषयत्वोपपत्तेश्च ; यस्य च अविद्याभ्रमो घटादिवत् विविक्तो गृह्यते, सः न अविद्याभ्रमवान्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: But there will be some difference in the self due to its being or not being the cause of ignorance, as in the case of man affected with the eyedisease called Timira or free from it.

Reply: No, for the Śruti denies that the Ātman by itself is the cause of ignorance, as in the passage, 'It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were' (Br.Up. 4.3.7); and the error we call ignorance is due to a combination of diverse activities. Another reason is that ignorance is an object witnessed by the self. He who visualises the error of ignorance as something distinct from his own self, like a jar etc., is not himself under that error.

अहं न जाने मुग्धोऽस्मीति प्रत्ययदर्शनात् ; अविद्याभ्रमवत्त्वमेवेति चेत् । न, तस्यापि विवेकग्रहणात् ; न हि यो यस्य विवेकेन ग्रहीता, स तस्मिन्भ्रान्त इत्युच्यते ; तस्य च विवेकग्रहणम् , तस्मिन्नेव च भ्रमः – इति विप्रतिषिद्धम्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Objection: Surely he is under that error, for one feels that one sometimes has the notion, ‘I do not know, I am confused.’

Reply: No, for that too is distinctly perceived. He who distinctly perceives a thing cannot surely be said to be mistaken about it; it is selfcontradictory to say that he perceives it distinctly, and at the same time, that he is mistaken about it.

Section 157

References:

न, आत्मनः अवस्थाभेदानुपपत्तेः। यदि तावत् आत्मनः बन्धमुक्तावस्थे, युगपत् स्याताम्, क्रमेण वा। युगपत् तावत् विरोधात् न सम्भवतः स्थितिगती इव एकस्मिन्। क्रमभावित्वे च, निर्निमित्तत्वे अनिर्मोक्षप्रसङ्गः। अन्यनिमित्तत्वे च स्वतः अभावात् अपरमार्थत्वप्रसङ्गः। तथा च सति अभ्युपगमहानिः ।

किञ्च, बन्धमुक्तावस्थयोः पौर्वापर्यनिरूपणायां बन्धावस्था पूर्वं प्रकल्प्या, अनादिमती अन्तवती च, तच्च प्रमाणविरुद्धम्। तथा मोक्षावस्था आदिमती अनन्ता च प्रमाणविरुद्धैव अभ्युपगम्यते। न च अवस्थावतः अवस्थान्तरं गच्छतः नित्यत्वम् उपपादयितुं शक्यम्। अथ अनित्यत्वदोषपरिहाराय बन्धमुक्तावस्थाभेदो न कल्प्यते, अतः द्वैतिनामपि शास्त्रानर्थक्यादिदोषः अपरिहार्य एव, इति समानत्वात् न अद्वैतवादिना परिहर्तव्यः दोषः

BGh. 13.2

Reply: No, since **it is not logical that the Self should have different states**. If this were possible at all, then the states of bondage and freedom of the Self should be simultaneous, or successive. As to that, they cannot occur simultaneously since they are contradictory – like rest and motion in the same object. Should they occur successively and without being caused, then there will arise the contingency of there being no Liberation; if they occur through some cause, then, since they do not exist inherently, there arises the contingency of their being ultimately unreal. In this case also the assumption becomes falsified. Moreover, when ascertaining the precedence and succession of the states of bondage and Liberation, the state of bondage will have to be considered as being the earlier and having no beginning, but an end. And that is contrary to valid means of knowledge. Similarly, it will have to be admitted that the state of Liberation has a beginning, but no end – which is certainly opposed to valid means of knowledge. And it is not possible to establish eternality for something that has states and undergoes a change from one state to another. On the other hand, if for avoiding the defect of non-eternality the different states of bondage and Liberation be not assumed, then, even for the dualists such defects as the purposelessness of the scriptures become certainly unavoidable. Thus, the situation being

similar (for both), it is not for the Advaitin (alone) to refute the objection.

अयं चापर आत्मनः संसारमोक्षयोः परमार्थसद्भाववादिनां दोष उच्यते – अनादेः अतीतकोटिरहितस्य संसारस्य अन्तवत्त्वं समाप्तिः न सेत्स्यति युक्तितः सिद्धिं नोपयास्यति । न ह्यनादिः सन् अन्तवान्कश्चित्पदार्थो दृष्टो लोके । बीजाङ्कुरसम्बन्धनैरन्तर्यविच्छेदो दृष्ट इति चेत् ; न, एकवस्त्वभावेनापोदितत्वात् । तथा अनन्ततापि विज्ञानप्राप्तिकालप्रभवस्य मोक्षस्य आदिमतो न भविष्यति, घटादिष्वदर्शनात्

Ma.Up. 4.3.30 Bh.

Here another defect is pointed out in the views of the disputants who hold that both bondage and liberation of the soul are real.

Of the transmigratory existence which has no beginning, i.e. devoid of bounds in the past, termination will not be reached through any reasoning, for in common parlance a thing that has no beginning is not seen to have an end. If it is held that there is a break in the continued relationship between the seed and the sprout (although it is beginningless), it is not so, since it has been rejected on ths ground that the seed and the sprout cannot be treated as a single substance (Karika IV-20). Similarly, there will be no possibility of even liberation which dawns on the attainment of knowledge, and which has a

beginning, to be exernal, for such is not the case with a jar or the like.

बीजाङ्कुराख्यो दृष्टान्तो यः, स साध्येन समः तुल्यो ममेत्यभिप्रायः । ननु प्रत्यक्षः कार्यकारणभावो बीजाङ्कुरयोरनादिः ; न, पूर्वस्य पूर्वस्य अपरभावादादिमत्त्वाभ्युपगमात् । यथा इदानीमुत्पन्नोऽपरोऽङ्कुरो बीजादादिमान् बीजं चापरमन्यस्मादङ्कुरादिति क्रमेणोत्पन्नत्वादादिमत् । एवं पूर्वः पूर्वोऽङ्कुरो बीजं च पूर्वं पूर्वमादिमदेवेति प्रत्येकं सर्वस्य बीजाङ्कुरजातस्यादिमत्त्वात्कस्यचिदप्यनादित्वानुपपत्तिः । एवं हेतुफलयोः । अथ बीजाङ्कुरसन्ततेरनादिमत्त्वमिति चेत् ; न, एकत्वानुपपत्तेः ; न हि बीजाङ्कुरव्यतिरेकेण बीजाङ्कुरसन्ततिर्नामैका अभ्युपगम्यते हेतुफलसन्ततिर्वा तदनादित्ववादिभिः

Ma.Up. 4.2.20 Bh.

The illustration of the causal relation existing between the seed and the sprout is itself the same as the major term in my syllogism, that is to say, the illustration itself is to be proved.

Objection: It is apparent that the causal relation of the seed and the sprout is without beginning.

Reply: It is not so. The beginning of all antecedents must be admitted, as is the case with the consequents. As a sprout just produced from a seed is with beginning, similarly the seed also, produced from another sprout (existing in the past), by the very succession implied in the act of production, is with beginning. Therefore all antecedent sprouts as well as seeds are with beginning.

As every seed and every sprout, among the seeds and the sprouts, are with beginning, so it is unreasonable to say that any one of these is without beginning. This is also equally applicable to the argument of the cause and the effect.

Objection: Each of the series of the seeds and the sprouts is without beginning.

Reply: No. The unity or oneness of such series cannot be justified. Even those who maintain the beginninglessness of the seed and the sprout, do not admit the existence of a thing known as the series of the seed and the sprout apart from the seed and the sprout. Nor do they admit such a series in the case of the cause and the effect.

यद्धि नष्टम् , तदेव नोत्पद्यत इति प्रध्वंसाभाववन्नित्योऽपि मोक्ष आरभ्य एवेति चेत् । न ; मोक्षस्य भावरूपत्वात् । प्रध्वंसाभावोऽप्यारभ्यत इति न सम्भवति अभावस्य विशेषाभावाद्विकल्पमात्रमेतत्

Tai.Up.Upod. Bh.

Objection: Since the very thing which is destroyed cannot be produced again, therefore liberation, though permanent, can be brought into existence just like non-existence in the form of destruction (which is brought about by action).

Answer: No, for freedom is a positive entity. [And not a non-existence, which destruction is.]
(Moreover) since non-existences, (as such), cannot be distinguished, it is a mere fancy to aver that non-existence in the form of destruction has a beginning.

Section 158

References:

सुवर्णादीनां तु
द्रव्यान्तरसम्पर्कादभिभूतस्वरूपाणामनभिव्यक्तासाधारणविशेषाणां क्षारप्रक्षेपादिभिः शोध्यमानानां स्वरूपेणाभिनिष्पत्तिः स्यात् । तथा नक्षत्रादीनामहन्यभिभूतप्रकाशानामभिभावकवियोगे रात्रौ स्वरूपेणाभिनिष्पत्तिः स्यात् । न तु तथात्मचैतन्यज्योतिषो नित्यस्य केनचिदभिभवः सम्भवति । असंसर्गित्वात् व्योम्न इव दृष्टविरोधाच्च

BSBh. 1.3.19

May be, that in the case of such things as gold etc., whose nature has become obliterated by their contact with other things, and whose peculiar speciality has thus become unobservable, and who are being purified by means of salts, acids etc., it is possible, that such things may thus manifest themselves in their own nature. Similarly, it may be that the stars etc. whose light is obscured during the day, do reappear in their proper

form, when during the night, they are separated from the daylight which obscures them. But a similar obliteration of that, which is eternal and whose light of intelligence is inherent in itself, by anything, is not possible, because like the Ākāśa (Vyoma) it is never in real contact with anything, and also because it is contrary to (our) experience.

न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः जीवतोऽन्यः भावः, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते । भावान्तरापत्तौ हि मोक्षस्य सर्वोपनिषद्विवक्षितोऽर्थः आत्मैकत्वाख्यः स बाधितो भवेत् ; कर्महेतुकश्च मोक्षः प्राप्नोति, न ज्ञाननिमित्त इति ; स चानिष्टः ; अनित्यत्वं च मोक्षस्य प्राप्नोति ; न हि क्रियानिर्वृत्तः अर्थः नित्यो दृष्टः ; नित्यश्च मोक्षोऽभ्युपगम्यते, 'एष नित्यो महिमाऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २३) इति मन्त्रवर्णात् ।

न च स्वाभाविकात् स्वभावात् अन्यत् नित्यं कल्पयितुं शक्यम् । स्वाभाविकश्चेत् अग्न्युष्णवत् आत्मनः स्वभावः, स न शक्यते पुरुषव्यापारानुभावीति वक्तुम्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

A man of realisation, after his death, has no change of condition–something different from what he was in life, but he is only not connected with another body. This is what is meant by his becoming 'merged in Brahman'; for if liberation was a change of condition, it would

contradict the unity of the Self that all the Upaniṣads seek to teach. And liberation would be the effect of work, not of knowledge which nobody would desire. Fuither, it would become transitory, for nothing that has been produced by an action is seen to be eternal, but liberation is admitted to be eternal, as the Mantra says, 'This is the eternal glory (of a knower of Brahman),' etc. (Br.Up. 4.4.23). Moreover, nothing but the inherent nature of a thing can be regarded as eternal. If **liberation is the nature of the self, like the heat of fire, it cannot be said to be a consequence of human activity (acting**).

यस्य तूत्पाद्यो मोक्षः, तस्य मानसं वाचिकं कायिकं वा कार्यमपेक्षत इति युक्तम् । तथा विकार्यत्वे च। तयोः पक्षयोर्मोक्षस्य ध्रुवमनित्यत्वम् । न हि दध्यादि विकार्यम् उत्पाद्यं वा घटादि नित्यं दृष्टं लोके

BSBh. 1.1.4

For him however, who holds liberation as something to be effected (by action), it would be logical to say that it depends upon the mental, vocal or bodily action. Liberation would certainly be transitory also in the case of those who consider it as being something which undergoes modification. In the ordinary worldly life, things like curds which result by modification (of milk) and things like an earthen pot which are the result of manufacture (from earth), are not observed to be everlasting.

नापि संस्कार्यो मोक्षः, येन व्यापारमपेक्षेत । संस्कारो हि नाम संस्कार्यस्य गुणाधानेन वा स्यात्, दोषापनयनेन वा । न तावद्गुणाधानेन सम्भवति,

अनाधेयातिशय-ब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वान्मोक्षस्य । नापि दोषापनयनेन, नित्यशुद्ध-ब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वान्मोक्षस्य

BSBh. 1.1.4

Nor is liberation something which admits of being subjected to a process of refinement, so that it should expect some sort of operation. Refinement can be effected either by the addition of some attribute (to a thing), or by the removal of some blemish (in it). It is not possible to refine liberation by the addition to it of some attribute. **Because liberation is of the nature of Brahman to which nothing can possibly be added. Nor is it possible to refine it by the removal of some blemish, because liberation is of the nature of Brahman which is eternally pure.**

Section 159

References:

योऽयं लौकिको वैदिकश् च व्यवहारः स उत्पन्न-विवेक-ज्ञानस्य स्थित-प्रज्ञस्याविद्या-कार्यत्वाद् अविद्या-निवृत्तै निवर्तते। अविद्यायाश् च

विद्या-विरोधान् निवृत्तिर् इत्य् एतम् अर्थं स्फुटी-कुर्वन्न् आह - या निशेति

BGh. 2.68

In the case of a man of steady wisdom in whom has arisen discriminating knowledge, those which are these ordinary and Veda dealings cease on the eradication of ignorance, they are being effects of ignorance. And ignorance ceases because it is opposed to Knowledge. For clarifying this idea, the Lord says:

मुक्तात्मनां हि संसारसंसारित्वव्यवहाराभावः सर्वैरेव आत्मवादिभिः इष्यते। न च तेषां शास्त्रानर्थक्यादिदोषप्राप्तिः अभ्युपगता। तथा नः क्षेत्रज्ञानाम् ईश्वरैकत्वे सति, शास्त्रानर्थक्यं भवतु, अविद्याविषये च अर्थवत्त्वम् - यथा द्वैतिनां सर्वेषां बन्धावस्थायामेव शास्त्राद्यर्थवत्त्वम्, न मुक्तावस्थायाम् एवम्

BGh. 13.2

People of all schools of thought who believe in the Self admit that there is no worldly behaviour or the behaviour of a worldling in the liberated ones. Yet, in their case (that is in those various schools), it is not admitted that there is any possibility of such a defect as the scriptures becoming useless, etc. **Similarly, in our case let the scriptures be useless when the knowers of the field become identified with Bhagavān; and purposeful within the sphere of ignorance**. This is just as in the case of all the dualists, where it is admitted that the scriptures

etc. become useful in the state of bondage, not in the state of Liberation.

Section 160

References:

एकवाक्यतया तु उपसंह्रियमाणं फलं नित्यमुक्तबुद्धशुद्धस्वभावता ।

अस्य न एकत्र पुञ्जीकृत्य प्रदर्शितेति तत्प्रदर्शनाय कण्डिका आरभ्यते । सुषुप्ते हि एवंरूपता अस्य वक्ष्यमाणा 'तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दा अपहतपाप्माभयं रूपम्ऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । २१) इति ।

Br.Up. 4.3.18-19 Bh.

If we consider all these passages together, the resulting sense is "that the self is by nature eternal, free, enlightened and pure. This comprehensive view has not yet been shown; hence the next paragraph. It will be stated later on that the self becomes such only in the state of profound sleep: 'That is his form–beyond desires, free from evils, and fearless' (Br.Up. 4.3. 21).

इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षः विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यम् , स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते, यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति । तत् एतत् प्रस्तुतम् – 'यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं

पश्यतिऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । १९) इति, तदेतत् वै अस्य रूपम् – यः सर्वात्मभावः 'सोऽस्य परमो लोकःऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । २०) इत्युक्तः

Br.Up.4.3.21 Bh.

Now liberation in the form of identity with all, which is the result, devoid of action with its factors and results, of knowledge, and in which there is no ignorance, desire, or work, is being directly pointed out. This has already been introduced in the passage, 'Where falling asleep it craves no desires and sees no dreams' (par. 19). That, this identity with all which has been spoken of as this highest state.

अत्र च एतत् प्रकृतम् – अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपम् , यत् सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षत इति

Br.Up.4.3.22 Bh.

Having mentioned this incidentally, the text takes up the topic under discussion, viz. that the form of the self that is directly perceived in the state of profound sleep is free from ignorance, desire and work.

एवमयं स्वाभाविके स्व आत्मनि सर्वसंसारधर्मातीतो वर्तते स्वापकाल इति

Br.Up.2.1.19 Bh.

So does it remain in its own natural self beyond all relative attributes during profound sleep.

नायमात्मा अन्यः अन्यत्र अभूत् , अन्यो वा अन्यस्मादागतः, साधनान्तरं वा आत्मन्यस्ति ; किं तर्हि । स्वात्मन्येवाभूत् । 'स्वमात्मानमपीतो भवतिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । १) 'सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवतिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । १) 'प्राज्ञेनात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तःऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । २१) 'पर आत्मनि सम्प्रतिष्ठतेऽ (प्र। उ। ४ । ९) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ; अत एव नान्यः अन्यस्मादागच्छति ; तत् श्रुत्यैव प्रदर्श्यते 'अस्मादात्मनःऽ इति, आत्मव्यतिरेकेण वस्त्वन्तराभावात्

Br.Up.2.1.19 Bh.

(So it is stated that) this self was not in any place different from itself, nor did it come from any place different from itself, nor is there in the self any means different from itself. What then is the import? That the self was in its own Śelf. (sva-ātmani-eva-abhūt). This is borne out by the Śruti passages, 'It merges in its own Self' (Ch.Up. 6.8.1), 'With Existence, my dear, it is then united' (Ibid.), 'Fully embraced by the Supreme Self' (Br.Up. 4.3.21), 'Rests on the Supreme Self,' etc. (Pr.Up. 4.9). For the same reason it does not come from any place different from itself. This is shown by the text itself,

'From this Self,' etc. For **there is no other entity besides the Self.**

Section 161

References:

न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः - तत् त्वं मृतो भविष्यतीति - एवं परिणेतुं शक्यः

BSBh. 3.3.32

It is not possible to construe that the passage "That thou art" means, that one would become so after death.

किन्तु विद्वान् सः इहैव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते; स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति । यस्मात् न हि तस्य अब्रह्मत्वपरिच्छेदहेतवः कामाः सन्ति, तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम् । न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः जीवतोऽन्यः भावः, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Rather this man of realisation is Brahman in this very life, although he seems to have a body. Being but Brahman, he is merged in Brahman. Because he has no desires that cause the limitation of non-Brahmanhood, therefore 'being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman' in this very life, not after the body falls. A man of realisation,

after his death, has no change of condition–something different from what he was in life, but he is only not connected with another body. This is what is meant by his becoming ‘merged in Brahman’.

अजस्य जन्मादिविक्रियारहितस्यात्मनो राजस्थानीयस्य पुरधर्मविलक्षणस्य । अवक्रचेतसः अवक्रम् अकुटिलमादित्यप्रकाशवन्नित्यमेवावस्थितमेकरूपं चेतो विज्ञानमस्येति अवक्रचेताः तस्यावक्रचेतसः राजस्थानीयस्य ब्रह्मणः यस्येदं पुरं तं परमेश्वरं पुरस्वामिनम् अनुष्ठाय ध्यात्वा । ध्यानं हि तस्यानुष्ठानं सम्यग्विज्ञानपूर्वकम् । तं सर्वैषणाविनिर्मुक्तः सन्समं सर्वभूतस्थं ध्यात्वा न शोचति । तद्विज्ञानादभयप्राप्तेः शोकावसराभावात्कुतो भयेक्षा । इहैवाविद्याकृतकामकर्मबन्धनैर्विमुक्तो भवति । विमुक्तश्च सन्विमुच्यते ; पुनः शरीरं न गृह्णातीत्यर्थः

Kath.Up. 2.2.1 Bh.

Of the birthless One (Self), which is free from all modifications, such as birth etc., which occupies the place of the king, and which is dissimilar to the properties of the city of the One whose knowledge is not crooked, whose consciousness is straight, verily present for ever like the light of the sun, i.e. of Brahman which is comparable to the king. By meditating after becoming entirely free from desires on Him to whom this city belongs, on the supreme Lord who is the owner of the cit for, his anusthana (lit. performace) consists in

contemplation with a view to complete knowledge by contemplating on Him as residing equally in all beings one does not grieve. How can there be any vision of fear since there is no occasion for sorrow after the attainment of fearlessness resulting from His realization? **Even here, (while still living), he becomes free from the bondage of desire and duty, created by ignorance and having become free (while still living);** he becomes emancipated, i.e. he does not take up a body again.

ब्रह्मैव हि मुक्त्यवस्था । न च ब्रह्मणोऽनेकाकार-योगोऽस्ति

BSBh. 3.4.52

Brahman itself is this condition of liberation, and there is no possibility of Brahman ever being of many sorts, because according to the scriptural statements.

Section 162

References:

शरीरे पतितेऽशरीरत्वं स्यात्, न जीवत इति चेत् । न; सशरीरत्वस्य मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तत्वात् । न ह्यात्मनः शरीरात्माभिमानलक्षणं मिथ्याज्ञानं मुक्त्वा अन्यतः सशरीरत्वं शक्यं कल्पयितुम् । नित्यम् अशरीरत्वम् अकर्मनिमित्तत्वाद् इत्यवोचाम

BSBh. 1.1.4

Objection: If it be objected, that disembodiedness supervenes after the body falls (i.e. when a person dies), and not while a person continues to live

Reply: No, because **the embodied condition itself is caused by wrong knowledge.** In the case of the Self it is not possible to conceive of any corporeality for the Self, otherwise than by the wrong knowledge of the nature of the vanity of the Self being possessed of a body. We have already said that the Self is eternally without a body, because of its not having action as its cause.

किञ्च न च विपरीतप्रत्ययो विद्यावत उत्पद्यते, निर्विषयत्वात् – अनवधृतविषयविशेषस्वरूपं हि सामान्यमात्रमाश्रित्य विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यमान उत्पद्यते, यथा शुक्तिकायां रजतमिति ; स च विषयविशेषावधारणवतो अशेषविपरीतप्रत्ययाशयस्योपमर्दितत्वात् न पूर्ववत्सम्भवति, शुक्तिकादौ सम्यक्प्रत्ययोत्पत्तौ पुनरदर्शनात् ।

क्वचित्तु विद्यायाः पूर्वोत्पन्नविपरीतप्रत्ययजनितसंस्कारेभ्यो विपरीतप्रत्ययावभासाः स्मृतयो जायमाना विपरीतप्रत्ययभ्रान्तिम् अकस्मात् कुर्वन्ति – यथा विज्ञातदिग्विभागस्याप्यकस्माद्दिग्विपर्ययविभ्रमः ।

सम्यग्ज्ञानवतोऽपि चेत् पूर्ववद्विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यते, सम्यग्ज्ञानेऽप्यविस्रम्भाच्छास्त्रार्थविज्ञानादौ प्रवृत्तिरसमञ्जसा स्यात् ,

सर्वं च प्रमाणमप्रमाणं सम्पद्येत, प्रमाणाप्रमाणयोर्विशेषानुपपत्तेः । एतेन सम्यग्ज्ञानानन्तरमेव शरीरपाताभावः कस्मादित्येतत्परिहृतम्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Moreover, false notions do not arise in a man of realisation, for there is then no object for them.

Whenever a false notion arises, it does so on account of a certain similarity of something to another, without ascertaining the particular nature of that thing, as when a mother of pearl is mistaken for a piece of silver. And this can nor more happen to one who has ascertained the particular nature of that thing, for the source of all false notions (that cursory resemblance) has been destroyed; as they no more appear when a right perception of the motherofpearl, for instance, has taken place. Sometimes, however, memories due to the impressions of false notions**, antecedent to the dawning of knowledge, simulating those notions, suddenly appear and throw him into the error regarding them as actual false notions; as one who is familiar with the points of the compass sometimes all of a sudden gets confused about them**.

If even a man of realisation comes to have false notions as before, then faith in realisation itself being shaken, no one would care to understand the meaning of the

scriptures, and all evidences of knowledge would cease to be such, for then there would be no distinction between things that are valid evidences and those that are not. This also answers the question why the body does not fall immediately after realisation.

कामान्यः कामयते मन्यमानः स कामभिर्जायते तत्र तत्र ।

पर्याप्तकामस्य कृतात्मनस्तु इहैव सर्वे प्रविलीयन्ति कामाः ॥

Mund.Up. 3.2.2 (sruti)

He who covets the desirable things, while brooding (on the virtues), is born amidst those very surroundings along with the desires. But for one who has got his wishes fulfilled and who is Selfpoised, all the longings vanish even here.

यस्तु परमार्थतत्त्वविज्ञानात्पर्याप्तकामः आत्मकामत्वेन परि समन्ततः आप्ताः कामा यस्य, तस्य पर्याप्तकामस्य कृतात्मनः अविद्यालक्षणादपररूपादपनीय स्वेन परेण रूपेण कृत आत्मा विद्यया यस्य, तस्य कृतात्मनस्तु इहैव तिष्ठत्येव शरीरे सर्वे धर्माधर्मप्रवृत्तिहेतवः प्रविलीयन्ति प्रविलीयन्ते विलयमुपयान्ति, नश्यन्तीत्यर्थः । कामाः तज्जन्महेतुविनाशान्न जायन्त इत्यभिप्रायः

Mund.Up. 3.2.2 Bh.

But, for him who has got his wishes fulfilled on the realization of the supreme Reality, for the man of fully

satisfied desires, for him who has secured all covetable things from everywhere by virtue of his craving for the Self; for one who is Self poised, for the man whose Self, having been weaned away from Its inferior aspect constituted by ignorance, has become established in Its own superior aspect through knowledge; all (longings), that induce virtuous or vicious activity vanish, that is to say, get dissipated; even here, even while the body lasts. The drift is that desires, consequent on the destruction of their causes, do not sprout again.

अत्र इहैव प्रदीपनिर्वाणवत्सर्वबन्धनोपशमात् ब्रह्म समश्नुते ब्रह्मैव भवतीत्यर्थः

Kath.Up. 2.3.14 Bh.

Hence, here itself owing to the cessation of all bondage, like the blowing out of a lamp, (he) attains Brahman, i.e. (he) becomes Brahman Itself.

परामृताः परम् अमृतम् अमरणधर्मकं ब्रह्म आत्मभूतं येषां ते परामृता जीवन्त एव ब्रह्मभूताः, परामृताः सन्तः परिमुच्यन्ति परि समन्तात्प्रदीपनिर्वाणवद्भिन्नघटाकाशवच्च निवृत्तिमुपयान्ति परिमुच्यन्ति परि समन्तान्मुच्यन्ते सर्वे, न देशान्तरं गन्तव्यमपेक्षन्ते

Mund.Up. 3.2.6 Bh.

Paramrtah: those to whom the supreme Immortality, the deathless Brahman, has become their very Self, those who have become Brahman while still living. Having (thus) attained identity with the supreme immortality, they attain the cessation of the worldly state like a lamp blown out or like the space in a pot (when broken); they become freed on every side, they do not stand in need of going elswhere.

तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

therefore 'being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman' in this very life, not after the body falls.

तस्मान्मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात् सशरीरत्वस्य, सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषोऽशरीरत्वम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Hence since the conception that the self is embodied is false, it has been proved that even while living the enlightened one can be bodiless.

दर्शयति च - 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।१५) इत्यादिना । ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शिनं प्रति समस्तस्य क्रियाकारकफललक्षणस्य व्यवहारस्याभावम् । न चायं

व्यवहाराभावोऽवस्थाविशेषनिबद्धोऽभिधीयते इति युक्तं वक्तुम् । 'तत्त्वमसि' इति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्यानवस्थाविशेषनिबन्धनत्वात्

BSBh. 2.1.14

The Scriptures, by the passage "When all this becomes but the Self to him, by what can he see and whom" (Br.Up. 4.5.15) etc., would discover to a person who understands Brahman as the Self of all, the non-existence of all phenomenal transactions such as actions, agents and the fruit of actions. It would not be proper to say, that this non-existence of all phenomenal transactions is spoken of as confined to any special condition (such as that of liberation), because the scriptural words "That thou art" show that the realization (of the fact) that Brahman is the Self of all, as mentioned in these very words, is not confined to any particular specific condition.

Section 163

References:

मुक्त्यवस्था हि सर्ववेदान्तेष्वेकरूपैव अवधार्यते

BSBh. 3.4.52

All Vedānta texts understand this condition of liberation to be of one uniform nature.

स्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तत्वेऽपि ब्रह्मणो नाप्यत्वम्, सर्वगतत्वेन नित्याप्तस्वरूपत्वात् सर्वेण ब्रह्मण आकाशस्येव

BSBh. 1.1.4

Even if Brahman is considered to be something different from one's own self, it is not capable of being obtained,

Because of its being all-pervading like the Ākāśa, and as all persons always happen to possess it in themselves as their own nature.

गत्यैश्वर्यादिश्रुतिविरोध इति चेत् अथापि स्यात् यद्यप्राप्यो मोक्षः, तदा गतिश्रुतीनाम् 'स एकधा' (छा। उ। ७ । २६ । २) 'स यदि पितृलोककामः भवति' (छा। उ। ८ । २ । १) 'स्त्रीभिर्वा यानैर्वा' (छा। उ। ८ । १२ । ३) इत्यादिश्रुतीनां च कोपः स्यात् इति चेत् ।

न ; कार्यब्रह्मविषयत्वात्तासाम् । कार्ये हि ब्रह्मणि स्त्र्यादयः स्युः, न कारणे ; 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति' (छा। उ। ७ । २४ । १) 'तत्केन कं पश्येत्' (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । १४)(बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

Objection: This (conclusion) runs counter to the Vedic texts about courses (that the departing souls follow), and the glory (that they attain), etc., Moreover, if emancipation be unobtainable, not only will the texts mentioning courses be contradicted, it will also contradict such Vedic texts as: 'He becomes one, (threefold, etc.), (Ch.Up. 7.26.

2); 'Should he become desirous of the manes as objects of enjoyment, (the forefathers appear by his very wish)' (Ch.Up. 8.2.1); '(he moves about.....) with women, or vehicles....(Ch.Up. 8.12.3).
Answer: No, for they (i.e. those texts) relate to the conditioned Brahman. Women or others can exist only in the conditioned Brahman, but not in the unconditioned, according to such Vedic texts as: 'One only, without a second' (Ch.Up. 6.2.1); 'Where one does not see anything else' (Ch.Up. 7.24.1); 'What will one see there and with what?' (Br.Up. 2.4.14; Br.Up. 4.5.15).

अस्य हि कार्य-ब्रह्मणो गन्तव्यत्वमुपपद्यते । प्रदेशवत्त्वात् । न तु परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि गन्तृत्वं गन्तव्यत्वं गतिर्वा अवकल्पते । सर्वगतत्वात् । प्रत्यगात्मत्वाच्च गन्तृणाम्

BSBh. 4.3.7

It is only towards qualified Brahman, an effect (of the unqualified Brahman), that any such approach (involving motion) is possible, because it has a definite local habitation (Loka in Brahma-Loka), while it cannot be imagined, that there can be any approach towards the transcendent unqualified Brahman, or that it can ever be an object of any such approach, or that any such approach (involving movement) towards it, is possible, for that unqualified Brahman is present everywhere and is the inner Self of all.

Section 164

References:

किं द्वे ब्रह्मणी परमपरं चेति ? बाढं द्वे – 'एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोंकारः (प्र। उ। ५ । २) इत्यादिदर्शनात् । किं पुनः परं ब्रह्म किमपरमिति, उच्यते – यत्र अविद्याकृतनामरूपादिविशेषप्रतिषेधात् अस्थूलादिशब्दैर्ब्रह्मोपदिश्यते, तत्परम् ; तदेव यत्र नामरूपादिविशेषेण केनचिद्विशिष्टम् उपासनायोपदिश्यते – 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरो भारूपः (छा। उ। ३ । १४ । २) इत्यादिशब्दैः, तदपरम् । ननु एवमद्वितीयश्रुतिरुपरुध्येत – न, अविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाधिकतया परिहृतत्वात्

BSBh. 4.3.14

Opponent: What? Are there then two kinds of Brahman, the Highest or unqualified Brahman and the Lower or qualified Brahman?

Reply: Well, of course there are these two kinds of Brahman. Because there is this scriptural passage, "Oh Satya-kāma, what this syllable 'Om' is, is the Highest and the Lower Brahman" (Pra.Up. 5.2).

Opponent: What again is the Highest Brahman and what the lower Brahman?

Reply: Wherever there is instruction about Brahman by means of such words as "not gross etc.", by denying the distinctions of names and forms brought about by ignorance, that is the Highest transcendent Brahman.

Where, as in the scriptural passage “Which has the structure of the mind, which has Prāṇa as the body, and which has the form (Rūpa) of brightness” (Chan.Up. 3.14.2), instruction is given about Brahman as having the distinction of names and forms for the purpose of meditation, that is the Lower i.e., qualified Brahman.
Opponent: But in this way, the scriptural declarations about non-duality would be contradicted.
Reply: No, because it is refuted by the fact that it is affected by the limiting adjuncts such as names and forms which are brought about by ignorance.

द्विरूपं हि ब्रह्मावगम्यते – नामरूपविकारभेदोपाधिविशिष्टम् , तद्विपरीतं च सर्वोपाधिविवर्जितम् । ‘यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । १४) ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्ऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १५) ‘यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमाथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यत्यन्यच्छृणोत्यन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पम् ; यो वै भूमा तदमृतमथ यदल्पं तन्मर्त्यम्ऽ (छा। उ। ७ । २४ । १) ‘सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि कृत्वाभिवदन्यदास्तेऽ (तै। आ। ३ । १२ । ७) ‘निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम् । अमृतस्य परं सेतुं दग्धेन्धनमिवानलम्ऽ (श्वे। उ। ६ । १९) ‘नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) ‘अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घम्ऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ८) ‘न्यूनमन्यत्स्थानं सम्पूर्णमन्यत्ऽ इति चैवं सहस्रशो विद्याविद्याविषयभेदेन ब्रह्मणो द्विरूपतां दर्शयन्ति वेदान्तवाक्यानि
BSBh. 1.1.12

Brahman is understood to be of two sorts, one, characterized by the limiting adjuncts of the differences in modifications by name and form, and the other, different from it, viz. one, in which all limiting adjuncts are absent. The following sentences (from the scriptures) in a thousand ways, indicate the two-fold nature of Brahman by distinguishing it with reference to the differences due to knowledge and ignorance viz. “For where there is duality as it were, then one sees another” (Br.Up. 2.4.14), “Where however the Self only is all this, whom can (he) see, and with what?” (Br.Up. 4.5.15), “Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else, that is Bhūmā (The Great One)”, “Where one sees something else, hears something else, knows something else, that is ‘the little’”, “That which is the Bhūmā is immortal, that which is ‘the little’ is mortal” (Chan.Up. 7.24.1), “The Self-possessed one, who having created all forms and named them, sits (quietly in repose) calling them by their names” (Tait. Ār. 3.12.7), Who is without parts, without actions, tranquil, without faults, without taint, the highest bridge of immortality, like a fire that has consumed its fuel” (Sve.Up. 6.19), (Whatever is predicated to be Brahman) is “Not that, not that” (Br.Up. 2.3.6), “It is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long” (Br.Up. 3.8.8), and

'defective is one place, perfect the other. Hundreds of passages such as these reveal the dual nature of Brahman, according as it is the object of knowledge or ignorance.

एवमेकमपि ब्रह्मापेक्षितोपाधिसम्बन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसम्बन्धं चोपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेषूपदिश्यत इति प्रदर्शयितुं परो ग्रन्थ आरभ्यते

BSBh. 1.1.12

It is with a desire to illustrate, that, even though Brahman is but one only, the Vedāntas are intended for instructing (a person) about it, either as being the object of devotion or as being the object of knowledge, according as it is desired to speak about its having a relation with limiting adjuncts, or as being absolutely divested of any such relation with limiting adjuncts, that the further portion of this treatise is begun.

Section 165

References:

‘न च पुनरावर्तन्ते’ (छा। उ। ८ । १५ । १) इति ‘इमं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्ते’ (छा। उ। ४ । १५ । ५) इत्यादि श्रुतिविरोध इति चेत् ।

न ; ‘इमं मानवम्’ इति विशेषणात् ‘तेषामिह न पुनरावृत्तिरस्ति’ (बृ। मा। ६ । १ । १८) इति च । यदि हि एकान्तेनैव नावर्तेरन् , इमं मानवम् इह इति च विशेषणमनर्थकं स्यात् । इममिह इत्याकृतिमात्रमुच्यत इति चेत् । न ; अनावृत्तिशब्देनैव नित्यानावृत्यर्थस्य प्रतीतत्वात् आकृतिकल्पना अनर्थिका । अतः इममिह इति च विशेषणार्थवत्त्वाय अन्यत्र आवृत्तिः कल्पनीया

Ch.Up. 5.10.2 Bh.

Objection: Does it not contradict the Upanisadic text, 'And they do not return' (Ch.Up. 8.15.1), 'They do not return to this whirl of Manu' (Ch.Up. 4.15.5)?
Reply: Not so, because there are the qualifying words, 'This whirl of Manu', and 'For them there is no return here'. If indeed they had not to return in the absolute sense, then the words 'this whirl of Manu' and 'here' would have become meaningless.
Objection: The words 'this' and 'here' are used by way of citing specimens only.
Reply: No. Since by the word 'non-return' itself is understood as non-return forever, it becomes useless to imagine them as mere examples. Therefore, to make the adjectives 'this', and 'here' meaningful, it has to be understood that the return occurs elsewhere.

कार्यब्रह्मलोकप्रलय-प्रत्युपस्थाने सति तत्रैव उत्पन्न-सम्यग्दर्शनाः सन्तः । तदध्यक्षेण हिरण्यगर्भेण सह अतः परं परिशुद्धं विष्णोः परमं पदं

प्रतिपद्यन्ते - इतीत्थं क्रम-मुक्तिः अनावृत्त्यादि-श्रुत्यभिधानेभ्योऽभ्युपगन्तव्या । न ह्ययञ्जसैव गतिपूर्विका पर-प्राप्तिः सम्भवतीत्युपपादितम्

BSBh. 4.3.10

When the dissolution of the worlds of Brahma-the-effect (Kārya-Brahman), is imminent, the Selfs, in whom correct i.e. perfect knowledge is generated there, attain the highest place of Viṣṇu, which is pure, and is even higher than this world of Brahma-the-effect (Kārya-Brahman), along with its presiding entity, the Hiraṇyagarbha. This **should be understood to be so from the scriptural statements about liberation by stages (Krama-mukti), and non-return (to this transmigratory existence) etc. It has been expounded (already) that the attainment of the Highest Brahman, as preceded by a movement of approach (Gati-pūrvikā) towards it, is properly not possible.**

आभूतसम्प्लवस्थानस्यामृतत्वेन विवक्षितत्वात् । तत्रैवोक्तं पौराणिकैः – 'आभूतसम्प्लवं स्थानममृतत्वं हि भाष्यते' (वि। पु। २ । ८ । ९७) इति

Ch.Up. 5.10.2 Bh.

since what is intended here by the word immortality is, living in a world which continues till dissolution of all objects. With regard to that itself the followers of the Puranas say: 'By the word immortality is meant the place which continues till the dissolution of all objects' (V.P.II.8.)

परब्रह्म-सामीप्यात् अपरस्य ब्रह्मणः, तस्मिन्नपि ब्रह्मशब्द-प्रयोगो न विरुध्यते । परमेव हि ब्रह्म
विशुद्धोपाधि-सम्बन्धं क्वचित्कैश्चिद्विकार-धर्मैः मनोमयत्वादिभिः उपासनाय उपदिश्यमानम् अपरम् इति स्थितिः

BSBh. 4.3.9

The use of the **word Brahman for the lower qualified Brahman is not contradictory**, by reason of its nearness to the Highest (transcendent) Brahman. **Because it is firmly established, that, in fact it is but the Highest Brahman itself, which, when it is in contact with pure limiting adjuncts such as intellect etc.), is described as having the qualities of an effect, such as having the mind as its structure etc., for the purpose of meditation**, and is described as the Lower qualified Brahman.

तस्मात् 'तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति' (छा। उ। ८ । ६ । ६) इति सगुणब्रह्मोपासकस्य प्राणैः सह नाड्या गमनम् , सापेक्षमेव च अमृतत्वम् । न साक्षान्मोक्ष इति गम्यते

Ch.Up. 5.10.2 Bh.

Therefore, it is understood that the statement, 'Going up through it, one attains immortality' (Ch.Up. 8.6.6), refers to the departure of the worshipper of the qualified Brahman, along with the organs through the hole on the top of the head; and the immortality (referred to) is only relative (dependent) and not absolute (direct) liberation.

ननु लोके गतस्यापि गन्तव्यता देशान्तर-विशिष्टस्य दृष्टा - यथा पृथिवीस्थ एव पृथिवीं देशान्तर-द्वारेण गच्छति । तथा अनन्यत्वेऽपि बालस्य कालान्तर-विशिष्टं वार्धकं स्वात्म-भूतमेव गन्तव्यं दृष्टम् । तद्वत् ब्रह्मणोऽपि सर्वशक्त्युपेतत्वात् । कथञ्चित् गन्तव्यता स्यादिति - न, प्रतिषिद्धसर्व-विशेषत्वाद् ब्रह्मणः । 'निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम्' (स्वे।उप्।६।१९)
'अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घम्' (ब्र्।उप्।३।८।८)
'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' (मुनुप्।२।१।२)
'स वा एष महानज आत्माजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म' (ब्र्।उप्।४।४।२५)
'स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा' (ब्र्।उप्।३।९।२६) इत्यादिश्रुति-स्मृति-न्यायेभ्यः न देशकालादि-विशेषयोगः परमात्मनि कल्पयितुं शक्यते । येन भूप्रदेश-वयोवस्थान्यायेनास्य गन्तव्यता स्यात् । भूवयसोस्तु प्रदेशावस्थादि-विशेषयोगाद् । उपपद्यते देशकाल-विशिष्टा गन्तव्यता

BSBh. 4.3.14

Opponent: But it is seen in the ordinary world that something which has already been arrived at, can still be something towards which movement is possible, having regard to its relation with specific different environment, as for instance, one who already is on this earth can be described as going to this very same earth by way of going from one part of it to another. Similarly, a child being itself (i.e. without being different), can be seen to be progressing towards its own old age, which of course pertains to its own Self, but is characterized by a different period of time. Even so, inasmuch as, Brahman equipped as it is with all kinds of power, may still be

something which can somehow admit of being approached.

Reply: No, because in the case of Brahman all special characteristics are denied. It is not possible to imagine any special relation (to subsist) as between the Highest Self and any such special circumstance as a particular environment or time etc.,

because of such scriptural passages as “(Brahman is) without parts, and without activity and it is tranquil, faultless and untainted” (Sve.Up. 6.19), “Neither gross nor subtle, nor short nor long” (Br.Up. 3.8.8), “He who is without and within, and is not liable to be born” (Mun.Up. 2.1.2), “The great unborn Self, ageless, deathless, immortal, fearless, Brahman” (Br.Up. 4.4.25), “He that can only be described (negatively) as ‘not so, not so’” (Br.Up. 3.9.26), and also as well by Smṛtis and reasoning. So that, on the ground of any such relation to particular environment in space or condition, it (the Highest Self) could be said to be something towards which movement is possible. As regards the earth and a person’s age, because of their having a relation to special conditions of environment of space and time respectively, the possibility of their being approached by movement towards them as being related to some specific conditions of environment and time, is reasonably sustainable.

Section 166

References:

परविद्या-प्रकरणेऽपि च । तत्-स्तुत्यर्थं
विद्यान्तराश्रयगत्यनुकीर्तनमुपपद्यते -
'विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति' (छन्।उप्।८।६।६) इतिवत्।
BSBh. 4.3.14

Besides, even in the chapter relating to the Vidyā of the Highest Brahman, it is reasonably sustainable to understand that the reference to the movement implied in another Vidyā, such as – "Very many other Nāḍīs are for the purpose of the going up (of the Jīva-Selfs)" (Chan.Up. 8.6.6), is for the glorification of the Vidyā of the Highest Brahman.

ये पुनर्मन्दब्रह्मविदो विद्यान्तरशीलिनश्च ब्रह्मलोकभाजः ये च
तद्विपरीताः संसारभाजः, तेषामेष गतिविशेष उच्यते
प्रकृतोत्कृष्टब्रह्मविद्याफलस्तुतये ।

किञ्चान्यत् , अग्निविद्या पृष्टा प्रत्युक्ता च । तस्याश्च
फलप्राप्तिप्रकारो वक्तव्य इति मन्त्रारम्भः

Kath.Up. 2.3.16 Bh.

But for those who are not much advanced in the knowledge of Brahman, who are engaged in other kinds of knowledge (i.e. in worship and meditation), and who

are fit for the world of Brahma, as also for those others who are ther opposite of these and are fit for worldly existence, this particular kind of path is stated with a view to eulogizing the superior result of the knowledge of Brahman that is being treated here. Moreover, the knowledge of fire had been questioned about and was imparted. The process of the attainment of the fruit of that knowledge has also to be described. Hence this verse is begun.

'प्रजापतेः सभां वेश्म प्रपद्ये' (छन्।उप्।८।१४।१) इति तु पूर्ववाक्य-विच्छेदेन ।

कार्येऽपि प्रतिपत्त्यभिसन्धिर्न विरुध्यते । सगुणेऽपि च ब्रह्मणि सर्वात्मत्व-सङ्कीर्तनम् 'सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः' इत्यादिवत् अवकल्पते । तस्मादपर-विषया एव गति-श्रुतयः

BSBh. 4.3.14

By separating the passage "May I reach the hall of the mansion of Prajāpati" (Chan.Up. 8.14.1) (from the passage preceding it), it would even not be contradictory (to understand) that this determinate belief (in reaching) is with reference to Brahma-the-effect. **Just as the qualified Brahman is spoken of as one to whom all actions and all desires belong, it is also possible to describe it, as being the Self of all**. Therefore, the scriptural statements

about ‘movement’ are with reference to Apara-Vidyā i.e. the Vidyā of qualified Brahman (Kārya-Brahman i.e. Brahma-the-effect).

अस्माल्लोकात्प्रेत्य दृष्टादृष्टेष्टविषयसमुदायो हि अयं लोकः, तस्मादस्माल्लोकात्प्रेत्य प्रत्यावृत्य निरपेक्षो भूत्वा एतं यथाव्याख्यातम् अन्नमयमात्मानमुपसङ्क्रामति विषयजातमन्नमयात्पिण्डात्मनो व्यतिरिक्तं न पश्यति, सर्वं स्थूलभूतमन्नमयमात्मानं पश्यतीत्यर्थः । ततः अभ्यन्तरमेतं प्राणमयं सर्वान्नमयात्मस्थमविभक्तम् । अथैतं मनोमयं विज्ञानमयमानन्दमयमात्मानमुपसङ्क्रामति । अथादृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते

Tai.Up. 2.8.5 Bh.

He, (lit. after departing), desisting, without expecting anything, from this world, the totality of things seen and unseen is verily indicated by the term 'this world'; without expecting anything from that world, attains this body built up by food, as explained already. The idea is that he does not perceive the totality of objects as different from the self, i.e. the body, built up by food; he sees all the gross elements as identical with the self built up by food. Then he attains this body constituted by the vital force, which is itself individed and is inside the (cosmic) body built up by all the food. Then he attains this body made of mind, the body made of intelligence, the body made of bliss. Then he reaches the state of fearlessness in the

unperceivable, bodiless, inexpressible, and supportless (Self).

अत एव च जक्षणादि-सङ्कीर्तनमपि दुःखाभावमात्राभिप्रायं स्तुत्यर्थम् ।

'आत्मरतिः' इत्यादिवत् । न हि मुख्यान्येव रतिक्रीडा-मिथुनानि आत्मनि शक्यन्ते वर्णयितुम् । द्वितीय-विषयत्वात् तेषाम्

BSBh. 4.4.6

Hence, the mention about it of eating etc. is meant merely to convey the absence of any misery, for the purpose of glorification, as it is, in the attribute of 'loving its own Self' (Ātma-ratiḥ) etc**. It is not possible to describe Brahman (alone by itself) as having the attributes of love, sport and love-play, in the principal meaning of the terms**, as they presuppose the existence of two entitles.

'जक्षत्क्रीडन्s (छा। उ। ८ । १२ । ३) इत्यादिश्रुतिविरोधोऽसंवेद्यत्व इति चेत् । न सर्वात्मैकत्वे यथाप्राप्तानुवादित्वात् – मुक्तस्य सर्वात्मभावे सति यत्र क्वचित् योगिषु देवेषु वा जक्षणादि प्राप्तम् ; तत् यथाप्राप्तमेवानूद्यते – तत् तस्यैव सर्वात्मभावादिति सर्वात्मभावमोक्षस्तुतये

Br.Up. 3.9.28.7 Bh.

Objection: If this bliss is not cognised, such Śruti texts as 'Laughing (or eating), playing/ etc., will be contradicted.

Reply: No for such srutis only admit of actions normally arising due to the identity with the All-Self.
When the man who is freed attains identity with the All-Self, wherever there is laughing etc. in the yogis or in the gods, the srutis simply speak of them as they are with regard to the man who is freed. As this is due to his identity with the All-Self, this is to serve as eulogy on liberation consisting in the identity with the All-Self.

Section 167

References:

निरस्ताशेषविशेषव्यापिब्रह्मात्मप्रतिपत्त्या प्रभिन्नसमस्ताविद्यादिग्रन्थेः जीवत एव ब्रह्मभूतस्य विदुषो न गतिर्विद्यते, 'अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते' (क। उ। २ । ३ । १४) इत्युक्तत्वात् 'न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति' (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । ६) इति श्रुत्यन्तराच्च

Kath.Up. 2.3.16 Bh.

By asserting 'He attains Brahman here' (Kath.Up. 2.3.14), it has been declared that there is no going for an enlightened man of whom all the knots of ignorance become destroyed on the realization of the identity of the Self with the allpervading and absolutely attributeless Brahman, and who becomes Brahman **even while living, which fact is also supported by another Vedic text: 'Of**

him the organs do not depart. Being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman.' (Br.Up. 4.4.6).

उत्क्रान्तिः गतिर्वा उपपद्यते, निमित्ताभावात् । 'अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते' इति च एवंजातीयकाः श्रुतयो गत्युत्क्रान्त्योः अभावं सूचयन्ति

BSBh. 4.2.13

Any such movement or going out (of the body) would not be reasonably sustainable, because of the absence of any proper cause for it. Besides scriptural passages such as "Here (in this very body) he attains Brahma-hood" also indicate the absence of any such movement or going out (on the part of one who has realized Brahman).

ब्रह्मणः पुरं हृदयपुण्डरीकं तस्मिन्यद्व्योम, तस्मिन्व्योमनि आकाशे हृत्पुण्डरीकमध्यस्थे प्रतिष्ठित इवोपलभ्यते । न ह्याकाशवत्सर्वगतस्य गतिरागतिः प्रतिष्ठा वान्यथा सम्भवति

Mund.Up. 2.2.7 Bh.

so 'the city of Brahman' means the lotus of the heart in the space that is within that heart; Brahman is perceived as though seated there in that space within the lotus of the heart; for, **any going, coming, or staying, in any other sense is impossible for one who is allpervasive like space.**

Section 168

References:

यथाप्राप्तानुवादित्वे दुःखित्वमपीति चेत् – योग्यादिषु यथाप्राप्तजक्षणादिवत् स्थावरादिषु यथाप्राप्तदुःखित्वमपीति चेत् । न, नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिसम्पर्कजनितभ्रान्त्यध्यारोपितत्वात् सुखित्वदुःखित्वादिविशेषस्येति परिहृतमेतत्सर्वम्

Br.Up. 3.9.28.7 Bh.

Objection: **If those passages merely describe what happens normally, then there is the chance of the liberated man's being affected by misery also. If, in other words, he partakes of the laughing etc., happening normally to the Yogins and others**, he may also suffer the misery that (plants and other) stationary existences experience.

Reply: **This is not so, for the attributes such as happiness and misery are superimposed due to the delusion (ignorance)** arising out of the contact with the limiting adjuncts, viz. the body and senses, which are but the creations of name and form. Thus have these doubts been all settled already.

ननु सर्वात्मत्वे दुःखसम्बन्धोऽपि स्यादिति चेत् । न दुःखस्याप्यात्मत्वोपगमादविरोधः । आत्मन्यविद्याकल्पनानिमित्तानि दुःखानि – रज्ज्वामिव सर्पादिकल्पनानिमित्तानि । सा च अविद्या

अशरीरात्मैकत्वस्वरूपदर्शनेन दुःखनिमित्ता उच्छिन्नेति
दुःखसम्बन्धाशङ्का न सम्भवति

Chand.Up. 8.12.1 Bh.

Doubt: But, in one's becoming the All Self, there can be the contact even with pain.

Reply: No, there is no contradiction, inasmuch as it is a settled fact that pain, too, becomes identified with the Self. **Sufferings in the Self are imagined through causes arising from ignorance, even as snake etc. arise on a rope due to imagination resulting from ignorance**. And that ignorance forming the cause of pain becomes eradicated consequent on the perception (true understanding) of the nature of identity of the bodilessness with the Self. Hence no doubt can arise here with regard to the contact with pain.

Section 169

References:

यथा वा भस्मच्छन्नस्य - एवम् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापित-नामरूपकृतदेहाद्युपाधियोगात् तदविवेकभ्रमकृतो जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्य-तिरोभावः । वाशब्दो जीवस्य ईश्वरात् अन्यत्वशङ्का-व्यावृत्त्यर्थः

BSBh. 3.2.6

Or when again it is covered over with ashes, similarly, the obscurement of the Knowledge and Lordship of the Jīva-Self is due to the confusion
resulting from the failure of discrimination caused by its contact with limiting adjuncts such as [the body etc. due to] names and forms which are brought about by ignorance. The word “or” (in the Sūtra) serves the purpose of the refutation of the doubt about the Jīva-Self and the Lord being entities separate from each other.

यो हि सुषुप्तावस्थमिव निर्विशेषमद्वैतम् अलुप्तचिद्रूपज्योतिःस्वभावम् आत्मानं पश्यति, तस्यैव अकामयमानस्य कर्माभावे गमनकारणाभावात् प्राणा वागादयो नोत्क्रामन्ति

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

He who sees the Self, as in the state of profound sleep, as undifferentiated, one without a second, and as the constant light of Pure Intelligence–only this disinterested man has no work and consequently no cause for transmigration; therefore, his organs such as that of speech do not depart.

न च प्राणैर्वियुक्तस्य गतिरुपपद्यते जीवत्वं वा सर्वगतत्वात्सदात्मनो निरवयवत्वात् प्राणसम्बन्धमात्रमेव हि
अग्निविस्फुलिङ्गवज्जीवत्वभेदकारणमित्यतः तद्वियोगे जीवत्वं गतिर्वा न शक्या परिकल्पयितुम् , श्रुतयश्चेत्प्रमाणम्

Ch.Up. 5.10.2 Bh.

Moreover, there cannot reasonably be any journey nor Jīvahood for one from whom the organs have departed. Since the reality which is the Self is allpervasive and has no parts, therefore Its mere relationship with the organs is the only cause of the differences of individual souls which are like sparks of fire. Therefore, if the Vedic texts are to be accepted as valid, then, when that (relationship) ceases, it cannot be imagined that there can be either the individual souls, or any journey.

अस्य हि कार्य-ब्रह्मणो गन्तव्यत्वमुपपद्यते । प्रदेशवत्त्वात् । न तु परस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि गन्तृत्वं गन्तव्यत्वं गतिर्वा अवकल्पते । सर्वगतत्वात् । प्रत्यगात्मत्वाच्च गन्तृणाम्

BSBh. 4.3.7

It is only towards qualified Brahman, an effect (of the unqualified Brahman), that any such approach (involving motion) is possible, because it has a definite local habitation (Loka in Brahma-Loka). While it cannot be imagined that there can be any approach towards the transcendent unqualified Brahman, or that it can ever be an object of any such approach, or that any such approach (involving movement) towards it, is possible, for that Brahman is present everywhere and is the inner Self of all.

सगुणविद्या-विपाकस्थानं तु एतत् स्वर्गादिवत् अवस्थान्तरम्,

यत्रैतदैश्वर्यमुपवर्ण्यते । तस्माददोषः

BSBh. 4.4.16

Where however this lordly power is spoken of, it is with reference to a different condition, similar to the condition of the heavenly world etc., where the Vidyā of the qualified Brahman ripens into fruition.

[Note: Such that we hear of gods like Indra and Vāyu, and the other lesser deities, functionaries, and Siddhas, who are all exalted Jīvas, not yet liberated and thus within Saṃsāra - ED]

Section 170

References:

जैमिनिस्त्वाचार्यः मनोवत् शरीरस्यापि सेन्द्रियस्य भावं मुक्तं प्रति मन्यते

BSBh. 4.4.11

Ācārya Jaimini is of opinion that a person who has attained liberation does possess a body together with the sense-organs quite as surely as the mind.

यथा प्रदीप एकः अनेकप्रदीप-भावम् आपद्यते । विकारशक्ति-योगात् । एवमेकोऽपि सन् विद्वान् । ऐश्वर्ययोगाद् अनेकभावम् आपद्य । सर्वाणि शरीराण्याविशति । कुतः? तथा हि दर्शयति शास्त्मम् एकस्यानेकभावम् - 'स एकधा भवति त्रिधा भवति पञ्चधा सप्तधा नवधा' (छन्।उप्।७।२६।२) इत्यादि

BSBh. 4.4.15

One as it is, becomes many (lamps), on account of its possessing the power to modify itself into an effect. In this way, a man that has attained knowledge, single as he is, having attained the condition of being many, by means of his lordly power. Enters into all the bodies. Whence is it so? Because the Śāstra indicates that one becomes many, by the scriptural passage – "He becomes one-fold, three-fold, five-fold, seven-fold, and ninefold etc." (ChanU.7.26.2).

आधिकारिको यः सवितृ-मण्डलादिषु विशेषायतनेष्ववस्थितः पर ईश्वरः, तदायत्तैव इयं स्वाराज्य-प्राप्तिरुच्यते

BSBh. 4.4.18

It is stated that the unity with the Self, attained (by the Jīva-Selfs), is dependent upon him who holds command over and resides in the particular abodes of the spheres of the Sun etc. (viz. the Highest Lord).

इतश्च न निरङ्कुशं विकारालम्बनानामैश्वर्यम् । यस्मात् भोगमात्रमेव एषाम् अनादि-सिद्धेनेश्वरेण समानमिति श्रूयते -

BSBh. 4.4.21

This is again why those who depend upon Brahma-the-effect (Kārya-Brahman) only, do not possess unlimited powers inasmuch as it is stated in the scriptures, that it is only this experience (Bhoga), that they have in common with the Eternal Lord.

नाडीरश्मिसमन्वितेन अर्चिरादिपर्वणा देवयानेन पथा ये ब्रह्मलोकं शास्त्रोक्तविशेषणं गच्छन्ति – यस्मिन्नरश्च ह वै ण्यश्चार्णवौ ब्रह्मलोके तृतीयस्यामितो दिवि, यस्मिन्नैरं मदीयं सरः, यस्मिन्नश्वत्थः सोमसवनः, यस्मिन्नपराजिता पूर्ब्रह्मणः, यस्मिंश्च प्रभुविमितं हिरण्मयं वेश्म, यश्चानेकधा मन्त्रार्थवादादिप्रदेशेषु प्रपञ्च्यते – ते तं प्राप्य न चन्द्रलोकादिव भुक्तभोगा आवर्तन्ते । कुतः ? 'तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेतिऽ (छा। उ। ८ । ६ । ६)(क। उ। २ । ३ । १६) 'तेषां न पुनरावृत्तिःऽ (बृ। उ। ६ । २ । १५) 'एतेन प्रतिपद्यमाना इमं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्तेऽ (छा। उ। ४ । १५ । ५) 'ब्रह्मलोकमभिसम्पद्यतेऽ (छा। उ। ८ । १५ । १) 'न च पुनरावर्ततेऽ इत्यादिशब्देभ्यः । अन्तवत्त्वेऽपि तु ऐश्वर्यस्य यथा अनावृत्तिः तथा वर्णितम् – 'कार्यात्यये तदध्यक्षेण सहातः परम्ऽ (ब्र। सू। ४ । ३ । १०) इत्यत्र ; सम्यग्दर्शनविध्वस्ततमसां तु नित्यसिद्धनिर्वाणपरायणानां सिद्धैव अनावृत्तिः ; तदाश्रयणेनैव हि सगुणशरणानामप्यनावृत्तिसिद्धिरिति

BSBh. 4.4.22

Those who go by the path of the Gods, which is connected with the Nāḍī and the ray (of the Sun) and have Arci etc. as its stages, towards the world of Brahman having special characteristics as stated by the Śāstra, thus – "That world of Brahman which is the third in the order of the heavens from here, and in which there are two seas (of nectar) by name Ara and Ṇya. A lake which consists of food which is intoxicating, an Aśvattha tree oozing Soma, a city of the Gods called Aparā-jitā in which there is a golden palace built by the Lord and which is often described at length in the Mantras and Artha-Vādas etc. Arrive there, but do not return from there, as some do from the world of the Moon after completing their experience (Bhukta-bhogāḥ)". Whence is it so? Because of the Scriptural statements – "Proceeding upwards they attain immortality" (Chan.Up. 8.6.6, Kath.Up. 2.3.16), "In their case there is no return" (Br.Up. 6.2.15), "Those who arrive by the path do not again return to this transitory worldly whirlpool" (Chan.Up. 4.15.5), "He attains the world of Brahman, and does not return" (Chan.Up. 8.15.1) etc. Even though their powers are liable to come to an end, as to how they never return has been indicated in "When there is a dissolution of the worlds of Brahma-the-effect, (the Selfs) along with the presiding deity, attain the Highest Brahman" (Brahma Sutra 4.3.10). That, in the case of those whose darkness

of ignorance has been dispelled by perfect knowledge, and who have resorted to the eternal Nirvāṇa, there is no return, has been established. Hence it goes without saying that those also who resort to qualified Brahman and have their resort in that Nirvāṇa do not return. ['Saguna Vidya' exists in the realm of Avidya alone, they do not return to mundane life].

जगदुत्पत्त्यादि-व्यापारं वर्जयित्वा । अन्यत् अणिमाद्यात्मकमैश्वर्यं मुक्तानां भवितुमर्हति । जगद्व्यापारस्तु नित्य-सिद्धस्यैव ईश्वरस्य

BSBh. 4.4.17

Barring the creation etc. of the world, they deserve to possess all other powers, such as Aṇimā (the power to reduce oneself to the dimension of an atom) etc. The operation of running this world however being the exclusive power of the eternally perfect Lord.

कथं पुनः मुक्तस्य अनेकशरीरावेशादि-लक्षणम् ऐश्वर्यम् अभ्युपगम्यते । यावता 'तत्केन कं विजानीयात्' (ब्र।उप्। ४।५।१५) । 'न तु तद्द्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद्विभक्तं यद्विजानीयात्' (ब्र।उप्। ४।३।३०) । 'सलिल एको द्रष्टाऽद्वैतो भवति' (ब्र।उप्। ४।३।३२) इति च एवंजातीयका श्रुतिः । विशेषविज्ञानं वारयति - इत्यत उत्तरं पठति - स्वाप्ययः सुषुप्तम् । 'स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते' (छन्।उप्। ६।८।१) इति श्रुतेः । सम्पत्तिः कैवल्यम् । 'ब्रह्मैव

सन्ब्रह्माप्येति' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।४।६) इति श्रुतेः । तयोः अन्यतराम् अवस्थाम् अपेक्ष्य । एतत् विशेष-संज्ञाऽभाव-वचनम् -

BSBh. 4.4.16

Opponent: How again is it understood that a person that has attained Final Release, can have the lordly power of entering into several different bodies, when Scriptural passages, such as – "Whereby and whom would one see" (Br.Up. 4.5.15), "There is nothing, however, that is other than himself, so that he can know of something which is separate from him" (Br.Up. 4.3.30), "He then is (clear) like water, is the only one that is a seer and is without a second" (Br.Up. 4.3.32), deny any special knowledge? Hence the reply is given, thus:

Reply: By complete merger, deep sleep is meant, because the scriptural passage says – "He becomes merged into himself, therefore, it is said that he sleeps" (Chan.Up. 6.8.1). Attainment (of unity) means a pure isolated condition (Kaivalya), because of the scriptural passage – "Himself being Brahman in fact, he becomes merged in Brahman" (Br.Up. 4.4.6). It is with reference to one of these two conditions, that the scriptures speak of the condition of the absence of any special cognition.

Section 171

References:

उपासनं च यथाशास्त्रं तुल्यप्रत्ययसन्ततिरसङ्कीर्णा च अतत्प्रत्ययैः शास्त्रोक्तालम्बनविषया च

Tai.Up. 1.3.2-4 Bh.

And meditation consists in a current of uniform concepts, not scattered with dissimilar ones, which proceeds according to the scripures and relates to an object enjoined in the scriptures.

तत्राविद्यावस्थायां ब्रह्मण उपास्योपासकादिलक्षणः सर्वो व्यवहारः

BSBh. 1.1.12

In the sphere of ignorance, Brahman can play the dual role of the devotee (the Jīva-Self), as well as the object of devotion (the Highest Self i.e., Brahman).

तत्रैतस्मिन्नद्वैतविद्याप्रकरणे अभ्युदयसाधनानि उपासनान्युच्यन्ते, कैवल्यसन्निकृष्टफलानि च अद्वैतादीषद्विकृतब्रह्मविषयाणि 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरः' (छा। उ। ३ । १४ । २) इत्यादीनि, कर्मसमृद्धिफलानि च कर्माङ्गसम्बन्धीनि । रहस्यसामान्यात् मनोवृत्तिसामान्याच्च – यथा अद्वैतज्ञानं मनोवृत्तिमात्रम् , तथा अन्यान्यप्युपासनानि मनोवृत्तिरूपाणि – इत्यस्ति हि सामान्यम्

Chand.Up.Upod. Bh.

There, in the section relating to the knowledge of nonduality, are discussed meditations which are the

means for the fulfilment of certain desirable ends; which yield results that go near to liberation, and which pertain to Brahman that is slightly modified from the Nondual (as described by the sruti), "He who permeats the mind, whose body is Prana (Cha.Upa. 3.14.2) etc. And these meditations are connected with the parts of actions, since they have for their fruits the prosperity accruing from actions. Owing to the similarities from the point of view of being mystic and of being a mental function **just as the knowledge of nonduality is purely a mental function, so also are these other meditations of the nature of mental functions there is identity between these two.**

Section 172

References:

कस्तर्हि अद्वैतज्ञानस्योपासनानां च विशेषः ? उच्यते । स्वाभाविकस्य आत्मन्यक्रियेऽध्यारोपितस्य कर्त्रादिकारकक्रियाफलभेदविज्ञानस्य निवर्तकमद्वैतविज्ञानम् , रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पाद्यध्यारोपलक्षणज्ञानस्य रज्ज्वादिस्वरूपनिश्चयः प्रकाशनिमित्तः ; उपासनं तु यथाशास्त्रसमर्थितं किञ्चिदालम्बनमुपादाय तस्मिन्समानचित्तवृत्तिसन्तानकरणं तद्विलक्षणप्रत्ययानन्तरितम् – इति विशेषः । तान्येतान्युपासनानि सत्त्वशुद्धिकरत्वेन वस्तुतत्त्वावभासकत्वात् अद्वैतज्ञानोपकारकाणि, आलम्बनविषयत्वात् सुखसाध्यानि च – इति पूर्वमुपन्यस्यन्ते । तत्र

कर्माभ्यासस्य दृढीकृतत्वात् कर्मपरित्यागेनोपासन एव दुःखं चेतःसमर्पणं कर्तुमिति कर्माङ्गविषयमेव तावत् आदौ उपासनम् उपन्यस्यते

Chand.Up.Upod. Bh.

What is then the distinction between the knowledge of nonduality and the meditations? This is being explained: **The knowledge of nonduality brings about the cessation of the notions of difference such as the doer, action, its auxiliaries and result naturally superimposed on the Self that is actionless**, just as the knowledge of the nature of a rope etc. caused by light removes the false notions of a snake etc. superimposed on it, whereas **meditation, accepting (for its basis), certain support established by the scriptures, maintains the uniformity of the flow of mental activity, uninterrupted by any notion that is different.** This is the difference between the two. **These meditations are discussed first, inasmuch as they are aids to the knowledge of nonduality** because of their being able to illumine the real nature of things through the purification of the mind and inasmuch as they have (for their basis) a substratum, they are effortlessly accomplished. Of these two, since man is firmly fastened with the practice of karma, the dedication of mind to meditation by abandoning karma is extremely difficult. Therefore, first of all, the meditation that forms part of karma, is discussed here.

Section 173

References:

तत्र कानिचिद्ब्रह्मण उपासनान्यभ्युदयार्थानि, कानिचित्क्रममुक्त्यर्थानि, कानिचित्कर्मसमृद्ध्यर्थानि । तेषां गुणविशेषोपाधिभेदेन भेदः । एक एव तु परमात्मेश्वरस्तैस्तैर्गुणविशेषैर्विशिष्ट उपास्यो यद्यपि भवति, तथापि यथागुणोपासनमेव फलानि भिद्यन्ते

BSBh. 1.1.12

There, some meditations on Brahman, have secular prosperity as their aim, while some have liberation by progressive stages as their aim, while some others have the richer augmentation i.e. maximization of religious actions, as their aim. These meditations are distinct from each other because of the distinction as between the different adjuncts viz. special qualities of each. Though it is but the only one, the Highest Self and the Lord, that is the object of devotion, as characterized by several distinct qualities, yet, the fruits of such meditations vary according to the particular aspect (of the Lord) with reference to which such meditations themselves vary.

नामादिषु प्रतीकोपासनेषु । पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मात् फल-विशेषम् उत्तरस्मिन्नुत्तरस्मिन् उपासने दर्शयति - 'यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथाकामचारो भवति' (छन्।उप्। ७।१।५) । 'वाग्वाव नाम्नो भूयसी' (छन्।उप्। ७।२।१)

‘यावद्वाचो गतं तत्रास्य यथाकामचारो भवति’ (छन्।उप्। ७।२।२) । ‘मनो वाव वाचो भूयः’ (छन्।उप्। ७।३।१) इत्यादिना । स च अयं फल-विशेषः प्रतीक-तन्त्रत्वाद् उपासनानाम् उपपद्यते

BSBh. 4.3.16

With respect to meditations on symbols (of Brahman) such as Nāman (name) etc., the Scriptures indicate a specially greater and greater fruit of each succeeding meditation than the one in the case of an earlier meditation by such passages as “He (who meditates on a Nāman as a symbol of Brahman) is free to go about at his pleasure, as far as the Nāman is capable of going” (Chan.Up. 7.1.5), “Speech (Vāk), indeed is greater than a Nāman” (Chan.Up. 7.2.1), “He is free to go about as far as speech (Vāk) can go” (Chan.Up. 7.2.2), “Mind, indeed is greater than speech” (Chan.Up. 7.3.1) etc.

This specially greater and greater nature of the fruit is reasonably sustainable, because meditations depend upon the technique of the symbols.

अत्र हि कर्मवत् उपासनानां भेदाभेदौ सम्भवतः । कर्मवदेव च उपासनानि दृष्टफलानि अदृष्टफलानि च उच्यन्ते । क्रममुक्तिफलानि च कानिचित् । सम्यग्दर्शनोत्पत्तिद्वारेण

BSBh. 3.3.1

Here also – like ritualistic actions (Karma) – difference and nondifference as between meditations (Upāsanās) is possible, and, as in the case of actions, meditations also

are spoken of as having visible and invisible fruits, and some are spoken of as having the fruit of Krama-mukti (liberation by stages) by way of the generation of correct i.e., perfect knowledge.

Section 174

References:

यद्वाचानभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युद्यते । तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ५ ॥

Kena.Up. 1.5 (sruti)

That which is not uttered by speech that by which speech is revealed, know that alone to be Brahman, and not what people worship as an object.

तदेव आत्मस्वरूपं ब्रह्म निरतिशयं भूमाख्यं बृहत्त्वाद्ब्रह्मेति विद्धि विजानीहि त्वम् । यैर्वागाद्युपाधिभिः 'वाचो ह वाक्ऽ 'चक्षुषश्चक्षुःऽ 'श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं मनसो मनःऽ (के। उ। १ । २) 'कर्ता भोक्ता विज्ञाता नियन्ता प्रशासिताऽ 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २८) इत्येवमादयः संव्यवहारा असंव्यवहार्ये निर्विशेषे परे साम्ये ब्रह्मणि प्रवर्तन्ते, तान्व्युदस्य आत्मानमेव निर्विशेषं ब्रह्म विद्धीति एवशब्दार्थः । नेदं ब्रह्म यदिदम् इत्युपाधिभेदविशिष्टमनात्मेश्वरादि उपासते ध्यायन्ति । तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि इत्युक्तेऽपि नेदं ब्रह्म इत्यनात्मनोऽब्रह्मत्वं पुनरुच्यते नियमार्थम्
अन्यब्रह्मबुद्धिपरिसङ्ख्यानार्थं वा

Kena.Up. 1.5 Bh.

That indeed, that Self in its true nature you know as Brahman (so called) because of its extensity (or unsurpassability) that which is allsurpassing and is called Bhuma, great (Ch.Up. 7.23.1). The significance of the word eva is this: Know the Self alone to be the unconditioned Brahman after eradicating all such adjuncts as speech because of which there occur such empirical expressions, with regard to the transcendental, unconditioned, unsurpassable, and equipoised Brahman, as 'It is the Speech of speech', 'the Eye of the eye', 'the Ear of the ear', 'the Mind of the mind', (Ke.Up. 1.2) the agent, the enjoyer, the knower, the controller, governor. 'Consciousness, Bliss, Brahman' (Br.Up. 3.9.28.7), etc. This is not Brahman which people meditate on as this, (as a limited object) possessed of distinctions created by limiting adjuncts as a non-Self, e.g. The Lord, etc. Although in the sentence, 'Know that alone to be Brahman', it has already been stated that the non-Self is not Brahman, still with a view to enounciating as explicit rule (that leaves no scope for option) the idea is repeated in the sentence, 'This is not Brahman'; or this may be with a view to excluding the identification of Brahman with what is not Brahman.

ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीत्तदात्मानमेवावेत् । अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति । तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्तथर्षीणां तथा मनुष्याणां तद्धैतत्पश्यनृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति । तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न देवाश्चनाभूत्या ईशते । आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति अथ योऽन्यां देवतामुपास्तेऽन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद यथा पशुरेवं स देवानाम् । यथा ह वै बहवः पशवो मनुष्यं भुञ्ज्युरेवमेकैकः पुरुषो देवान्भुनक्त्येकस्मिन्नेव पशावादीयमानेऽप्रियं भवति किमु बहुषु तस्मादेषां तन्न प्रियं यदेतन्मनुष्या विद्युः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 (sruti)

This (self) was indeed Brahman in the beginning. It knew only Itself as, 'I am Brahman'. Therefore, It became all. And whoever among the gods knew It also became That, and the same with sages and men. The sage Vamadeva, while realising this (self) as That, knew, 'I was Manu, and the sun'. And to this day whoever in like manner knows It as, 'I am Brahman', becomes all this (universe). Even the gods cannot prevail against him, for he becomes their self. While he who worships another god thinking, 'He is one, and I am another', does not know. He is like an animal to the gods. As many animals serve a man, so does each man serve the gods. Even if one animal is taken away, it causes anguish, what should one say of many animals? Therefore, it is not liked by them that men should know this.

अथ यः कश्चिदब्रह्मवित् , अन्यामात्मनो व्यतिरिक्तां यां काञ्चिद्देवताम् , उपास्ते
स्तुतिनमस्कारयागबल्युपहारप्रणिधानध्यानादिना उप आस्ते तस्या गुणभावमुपगम्य आस्ते – अन्योऽसावनात्मा मत्तः पृथक् , अन्योऽहमस्म्यधिकृतः, मया अस्मै ऋणिवत्प्रतिकर्तव्यम् – इत्येवंप्रत्ययः सन्नुपास्ते, न स इत्थंप्रत्ययः वेद विजानाति तत्त्वम्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

While he, one is not a knower of Brahman, who worships another god, a god different from himself, approaches him in a subordinate position, offering him praises, salutations, sacrifices, presents, devotion, meditation, etc., thinking, 'He is one, non-self, different from me, and I am another, qualified for rites, and I must serve him like a debtor' worships him with such ideas, does not know the truth.

न च आत्मानम् ईश्वरं प्रमाणतः बुद्ध्वा कस्यचित् गुणभावं जिगमिषति कश्चित्, विरोधात्

BGh. 12.12

Also, no one who has realized his Self as Bhagavān through valid means of knowledge would like subordination to another, since it involves a contradiction.

Section 175

References:

न तावत्स्वत एव परस्य ब्रह्मण उभयलिङ्गत्वमुपपद्यते । न हि एकं वस्तु स्वत एव रूपादिविशेषोपेतं तद्विपरीतं च इत्यवधारयितुं शक्यम् । विरोधात् ।

अस्तु तर्हि स्थानतः, पृथिव्याद्युपाधियोगादिति । तदपि नोपपद्यते - न हि उपाधियोगाद् अप्यन्यादृशस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यादृशः स्वभावः सम्भवति । न हि स्वच्छः सन् स्फटिकः अलक्तकाद्युपाधियोगाद् अस्वच्छो भवति । भ्राममात्रत्वाद् अस्वच्छताभिनिवेशस्य । उपाधीनां च अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितत्वात् । अतश्च अन्यतर-लिङ्गपरिग्रहेऽपि । समस्तविशेषरहितं निर्विकल्पकमेव ब्रह्म प्रतिपत्तव्यम्, न तद्विपरीतम्

BSBh. 3.2.11

Reply: That the transcendent Brahman considered by and in itself alone should possess both kinds of indicatory marks, is not reasonably sustainable. It is not possible to understand that one and the same entity, in itself, is both endowed with specific attributes such as form (Rūpa) etc. and also as being the reverse of that (i.e. being without any attributes), because of the contradiction (involved).

Opponent: Well, let it then be understood to be (endowed with specific attributes) by reason of a particular local limiting adjunct (such as the earth etc.).

Reply: Even that is not reasonably sustainable. It is not possible that an entity being of one nature only should have a different characteristic merely because of its being affected by limiting adjuncts. A crystal which in itself is white, is not rendered as being coloured, by its being affected by a limiting adjunct such as red lac or resin

(Alaktaka) because the notion about its being coloured is only illusory. Besides **limiting adjuncts are brought about by ignorance**. Hence, when only one indicatory mark alone out of the two has to be accepted, Brahman should be understood to be devoid of any specific attributes and as not admitting of any such alternative, as being also the reverse of it.

रूपाद्याकाररहितमेव हि ब्रह्म अवधारयितव्यम् । न रूपादिमत् । कस्मात्? तत्प्रधानत्वात् । 'अस्थूलमनण्वह्रस्वमदीर्घम्' (ब्र्।उप्। ३।८।८) 'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययम्' (कथ्।उप्। १।३।१५), (मुक्ति। २-७२), 'आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म' (छन्।उप् ८।१४।१), 'दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' (मुन्द्।उप्। २।१।२), 'तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरम् अनन्तरमबाह्यम् अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूः' (ब्र्।उप्। २।५।१९) इति । एवमादीनि वाक्यानि निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वप्रधानानि, न अर्थान्तरप्रधानानि - इत्येतत्प्रतिष्ठापितम् 'तत्तु समन्वयात्' (ब्र्स्।१।१।४) इत्यत्र । तस्मादेवंजातीयकेषु वाक्येषु यथाश्रुतं । निराकारमेव ब्रह्म अवधारयितव्यम्

BSBh. 3.2.14

Brahman ought only to be understood to be without any form etc. and not as having a form. Whence is it so? Because that is the main purport (of the Scriptures). That, those Scriptural passages such as "Neither gross nor fine, nor short nor long" (Br.Up. 3.8.8); "(It is) without any sound, touch, form, or decay" (Kath.Up.1.3.15, Muktik.

2.72); “(This) Ākāśa verily is the revealer of names and forms. That, within which these are, is Brahman” (Chan.Up .8.14.1); “That divine and incorporeal Puruṣa who is both outside and inside and is not subject to be born” (Mun.Up. 2.1.2); “That which is this Brahman, which neither is a cause nor an effect, and is without anything inside or outside (of it). This Self which is Brahman, which perceives everything” (Br.Up. 2.5.19) – Have the Brahma-Self, which is without any transmigratory nature i.e. without any extension (Niṣprapañca), and nothing else, as their only purport has already been established, in “It is Brahman, because (All Vedānta texts) have that connected sequence” (Brahma Sutra 1.1.4). Therefore, as expressed in such passages in the scriptures, Brahman should be understood to be without any form.

Section 176

References:

न चोपासनार्थश्रुतशब्दोत्थविज्ञानविषयस्यायथार्थत्वे प्रमाणमस्ति । न च तद्विज्ञानस्यापवादः श्रूयते । ततः श्रेयःप्राप्तिदर्शनाद्यथार्थतां प्रतिपद्यामहे । विपर्यये चानर्थप्राप्तिदर्शनात् – यो हि विपर्ययेणार्थं प्रतिपद्यते लोके – पुरुषं स्थाणुरिति, अमित्रं मित्रमिति वा, सोऽनर्थं प्राप्नुवन्दृश्यते । आत्मेश्वरदेवतादीनामप्ययथार्थानामेव चेद्ग्रहणं श्रुतितः, अनर्थप्राप्त्यर्थं शास्त्रमिति ध्रुवं प्राप्नुयाल्लोकवदेव ; न

चैतदिष्टम् । तस्माद्यथाभूतानेवात्मेश्वरदेवतादीन्ग्राहयत्युपासनार्थं शास्त्रम्

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

Besides there is nothing to disprove the truth of objects corresponding to notions conveyed by the words of the scriptures enjoining a meditation. Nor is there any exception in the Śrutis to meditation on the vital force as pure etc. **Since that meditation, we see, is conducive to our wellbeing, we accept it as true**. And we see that the opposite course leads to evil. We notice in life that one who misjudges things–takes a man, for instance, for a stump, or an enemy for a friend–comes to grief. Similarly, if the Self, the Lord, the deities and so forth, of whom we hear from the scriptures, prove fictitious, then the scriptures, like secular things, would be a veritable source of evil; but this is acceptable to neither of us. Therefore, we conclude that the scriptures present, for purposes of meditation, the Self, the Lord, the deities and so on, as real.

इतराणि तु आकारवद्ब्रह्म-विषयाणि वाक्यानि न तत्प्रधानानि । उपासनाविधि-प्रधानानि हि तानि । तेष्वसति विरोधे । यथाश्रुतमाश्रयितव्यम् । सति तु विरोधे । तत्प्रधानानि अतत्प्रधानेभ्यो बलीयांसि भवन्ति - इत्येष विनिगमनायां हेतुः ।
येन उभयीष्वपि श्रुतिषु सतीषु । अनाकारमेव ब्रह्म अवधार्यते । न पुनर्विपरीतमिति

BSBh. 3.2.14

All other passages which refer to qualified Brahman as having a form, are not passages which display the chief purport. Their purport is to speak of an injunction to meditation, and when there is no conflict, they should be understood as they are stated in the scriptures. When however, there is a conflict, this is the reason [as to which are clearly the purport from those that are not] by means of which, even when scriptural passages are of both sorts. **It is the formless Brahman alone that is understood and not the other (i.e., qualified Brahman).**

ननु विशेषोऽपि दृश्यते – छान्दोग्ये हृदयाकाशस्य गुणयोगः, वाजसनेयके तु आकाशाश्रयस्य ब्रह्मण इति – न, 'दहर उत्तरेभ्यः' (ब्र। सू। १ । ३ । १४) इत्यत्र च्छान्दोग्येऽपि आकाशशब्दं ब्रह्मैवेति प्रतिष्ठापितत्वात् । अयं तु अत्र विद्यते विशेषः – सगुणा हि ब्रह्मविद्या छान्दोग्ये उपदिश्यते – 'अथ य इहात्मानमनुविद्य व्रजन्त्येता□श्च सत्यान्कामान्' (छा। उ। ८ । १ । ६) इत्यात्मवत् कामानामपि वेद्यत्वश्रवणात् , वाजसनेयके तु निर्गुणमेव परम्ब्रह्म उपदिश्यमानं दृश्यते – 'अत ऊर्ध्वं विमोक्षाय ब्रूहि' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । १४) 'असङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः' (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । १५) इत्यादिप्रश्नप्रतिवचनसमन्वयात् । वशित्वादि तु तत्स्तुत्यर्थमेव गुणजातं वाजसनेयके सङ्कीर्त्यते ; तथा च उपरिष्टात् 'स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा' (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २६) इत्यादिना निर्गुणमेव ब्रह्म उपसंहरति । गुणवतस्तु ब्रह्मण एकत्वात् विभूतिप्रदर्शनाय अयं गुणोपसंहारः सूत्रितः, नोपासनाय – इति द्रष्टव्यम्

BSBh. 3.3.39

Opponent: But as between them, we observe particular differences also. For instance in the Chāndogya, the attributes belong to the Ākāśa of the Hṛdaya. While in the Vāja-saneyaka they belong to Brahman which is the support of that Ākāśa.

Reply: No, because in Brahma Sutra 1.3.14, it has been established that the word Ākāśa in the Chāndogya means Brahman. This however is the particular difference here. In the Chāndogya the Vidyā of qualified Brahman is taught, because the passage "Now, those who having realized the Self and its true desires, here during life, depart from this body" speaks of the Self, as also of the desires, as the things to be known. In the Vāja-saneyaka, however, the instruction is about the unqualified transcendent Brahman as is evident from the coordination of the question and the reply, "Now after this, tell me about (that which leads to) liberation" (Br.Up. 4.3.14 and "This Puruṣa is unattached" (Br.Up. 4.3.15) respectively. In the Vāja-saneyaka the set of attributes such as being the ruler etc., is stated for the purpose of the glorification of the Self, and, afterwards by the concluding portion "That Ātmā which is (negatively) described as 'not so', 'not so'" etc., it is the unqualified Brahman that is spoken of. As however **the qualified Brahman is (essentially) the same as the unqualified Brahman.** It should be understood that the combining of the attributes as stated

in the Sūtra, is merely for the purpose of illustrating the exalted stature of Brahman and not for the purpose of contemplation.

Section 177

References:

कथं तर्हि 'आत्मान्वेष्टव्यः' 'आत्मलाभान्न परं विद्यते' इति श्रुतिस्मृती,
यावता न लब्धैव लब्धव्यो भवतीत्युक्तम् ?
बाढम् - तथाप्यात्मनोऽप्रच्युतात्मभावस्यैव सतस्तत्त्वानवबोधनिमित्तो मिथ्यैव देहादिष्वनात्मसु आत्मत्वनिश्चयो लौकिको दृष्टः । तेन देहादिभूतस्यात्मनोऽपि आत्मा - अनन्विष्टः 'अन्वेष्टव्यः', अलब्धः 'लब्धव्यः', अश्रुतः 'श्रोतव्यः', अमतः 'मन्तव्यः', अविज्ञातः 'विज्ञातव्यः' - इत्यादिभेदव्यपदेश उपपद्यते
BSBh. 1.1.17

Opponent: If then it is said that the recipient cannot at the same time be that which is received, how then (would you reconcile) the scriptural and Smṛti sentences – "The Self is to be sought for", "There is nothing higher than the attainment of the Self"?
Reply: Oh, alright (we say). But the Self, even though it is something which never deviates from its own selfhood (nature), yet, in ordinary life, we see (the phenomenon), that because of not having properly understood the truth,

there is a conviction that the body etc. which really are not the Selfs, are the Selfs. And therefore, in the case of the Jīva-Self which has (through ignorance) egoistically identified itself with a body, scriptural instruction which makes a difference (between the highest Self and the Jīva-Self), thus – "The Self, which is not yet searched for, deserves to be searched, which is not yet heard, deserves to be heard, which is not yet cogitated upon, deserves to be cogitated upon, and which is not yet understood, deserves to be understood", becomes reasonably sustainable.

विद्युपास्त्योश्च वेदान्तेषु अव्यतिरेकेण प्रयोगो दृश्यते
BSBh. 4.4.1
It is seen that the terms 'he should know', 'he should meditate' are used in Vedānta texts without any distinction i.e., as synonymous.

ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत । ओमिति ह्युद्गायति तस्योपव्याख्यानम्
Chand.Up. 1.1.1 (sruti)
One should meditate on this letter Om which is Udgitha. Since one starts singing the Udgitha by uttering Om, therefore its proximate exposition is being commenced.

अतः तदेतत् , अक्षरं वर्णात्मकम्
उद्गीथभक्त्यवयवत्वादुद्गीथशब्दवाच्यम् , उपासीत –
कर्माङ्गावयवभूते ओङ्कारेपरमात्मप्रतीके दृढामैकाग्र्यलक्षणां मतिं
सन्तनुयात्

Chand.Up. 1.1.1 Bh.

Therefore, this letter Om which is such, and is referred to as Udgitha since it constitutes a part of the portion of the sama song called Udgitha, is to be meditated on in its verbal form. (That is) one should continuously concentrate one's mind on Om which forms a part of rites and is a symbol of the supreme Reality.

तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्तन्नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतासौनामायमिदंरूप इति तदिदमप्येतर्हि नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतेऽसौनामायमिदंरूप इति स एष इह प्रविष्टः । आ नखाग्रेभ्यो यथा क्षुरः क्षुरधानेऽवहितः स्याद्विश्वम्भरो वा विश्वम्भरकुलाये तं न पश्यन्ति । अकृत्स्नो हि स प्राणन्नेव प्राणो नाम भवति । वदन्वाक्पश्यंश्चक्षुः शृण्वञ्श्रोत्रं मन्वानो मनस्तान्यस्यैतानि कर्मनामान्येव । स योऽत एकैकमुपास्ते न स वेदाकृत्स्नो ह्येषोऽत एकैकेन भवत्यात्मेत्येवोपासीतात्र ह्येते सर्व एकं भवन्ति । तदेतत्पदनीयमस्य सर्वस्य यदयमात्मानेन ह्येतत्सर्वं वेद । यथा ह वै पदेनानुविन्देदेवं कीर्तिं श्लोकं विन्दते य एवं वेद

Br.Up. 1.4.7 (sruti)

This (universe) was then undifferentiated. It differentiated only into name and form–it was called such and such and was of such and such form. So to this day it is differentiated only into name and form–it is called such

and such, and is of such and such form. This Self has entered into these bodies up to the tip of the nails–as a razor may be put in its case, or as fire, which sustains the world, may be in its source. People do not see It, for (viewed in Its aspects) It is incomplete. When It does the function of living, It is called the vital force; when It speaks, the organ of speech; when It sees, the eye; when It hears, the ear; and when It thinks, the mind. These are merely Its names according to functions. He who meditates upon each of this totality of aspects does not know, for It is incomplete, (being divided) from this totality by possessing a single characteristic. The Self alone is to be meditated upon, for all these are unified in It. Of all these, this Self alone should be realised, for one knows all these through It, just as one may get (an animal) through its footprints. He who knows It as such obtains fame and association (with his relatives).

कथं पुनः पश्यन्वेदेत्याह – आत्मेत्येव आत्मेति – प्राणादीनि विशेषणानि यान्युक्तानि तानि यस्य सः – आप्नुवंस्तान्यात्मेत्युच्यते । स तथा कृत्स्नविशेषोपसंहारी सन्कृत्स्नो भवति । वस्तुमात्ररूपेण हि प्राणाद्युपाधिविशेषक्रियाजनितानि विशेषणानि व्याप्नोति । तथा च वक्ष्यति – ‘ध्यायतीव लेलायतीवऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ३ । ७) इति । तस्मादात्मेत्येवोपासीत । एवं कृत्स्नो ह्यसौ स्वेन वस्तुरूपेण गृह्यमाणो भवति

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Through what kind of vision can he know It? This is being explained: The Self alone is to be meditated upon. That which possesses the characteristics such as living that have been mentioned–includes them–is the Self. Combining all the characteristics, It then becomes the whole. It is as the Reality that It includes those characteristics due to the functions of particular limiting adjuncts such as the vital force. As it will be said later on, 'It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were' (Br.Up. 4.3.7). Therefore, the Self alone is to be meditated upon. When perceived (recognized) thus as the Reality, It becomes complete.

अथ यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म
दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव
विजिज्ञासितव्यमिति
Chand.Up. 8.1.1 (sruti)
(Om) Now, in this city of Brahman, there is a mansion in the shape of a small lotus; in it is a small inner Akasa. What is within that, that should be sought; that indeed, one should desire to understand.

दहरः अल्पतरः अस्मिन्दहरे वेश्मनि वेश्मनः
अल्पत्वात्तदन्तर्वर्तिनोऽल्पतरत्वं वेश्मनः । अन्तराकाशः आकाशाख्यं
ब्रह्म ।

‘आकाशो वै नाम’ (छा। उ। ८ । १४ । १) इति हि वक्ष्यति । आकाश इव अशरीरत्वात् सूक्ष्मत्वसर्वगतत्वसामान्याच्च । तस्मिन्नाकाशाख्ये यदन्तः मध्ये तदन्वेष्टव्यम् । तद्वाव तदेव च विशेषेण जिज्ञासितव्यं गुर्वाश्रयश्रवणाद्युपायैरन्विष्य च साक्षात्करणीयमित्यर्थः

Chand.Up. 8.1.1 Bh.

Dahara means small. In this small mansion because the mansion is small, that which exists within, i.e., the inner Akasa called Brahman, is smaller than the mansion. 'The Self called Akasa is certainly the revealer of name and form' (Chand.Up. 8.14.1). Thus, the sruti shall speak later. Because incorporeity, subtlety, and allpervasiveness form the common features, (Brahman is like Akasa). That is to be inquired into what exists in that which is called Akasa. **That (i.e. Brahman) alone one should seek to know particularly, that is to say, with the help of instruction of the teacher and through means such as hearing and the rest, one is to inquire into and realize it.**

य आत्मापहतपाप्मा विजरो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः स सर्वांश्च लोकानाप्नोति सर्वांश्च कामान्यस्तमात्मानमनुविद्य विजानातीति ह प्रजापतिरुवाच

Chand.Up. 8.7.1 (sruti)

The Atman which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger and thirst, whose desire is of the truth, whose resolve is of the truth, he should be sought, him one should desire to

understand. He who has found out and who understands that Atman attains all the worlds and all the desires. Thus spoke Prajapati.

सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः शास्त्राचार्योपदेशैर्ज्ञातव्यः स विशेषेण ज्ञातुमेष्टव्यः विजिज्ञासितव्यः स्वसंवेद्यतामापादयितव्यः

Chand.Up. 8.7.1 Bh.

That is to be inquired into, is to be realized through the scriptures and the instruction of the preceptor; it is desirable that It should be realized in the proper perspective, that is to say, It is worthy of being made the object of one's realization.

Section 178

References:

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यो मैत्रेय्यात्मनि खल्वरे दृष्टे श्रुते मते विज्ञात इदं सर्वं विदितम्

Br.Up. 4.5.6 (sruti, last part)

The Self, my dear Maitreyī, should be realised–should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon. When the Self, my dear, is realised by being heard of, reflected on and meditated upon, all this is known.

अहिंसाब्रह्मचर्यादीनां च विद्यां प्रत्युपकारकत्वात् , साक्षादेव च कारणत्वाच्छ्रवणमननिदिध्यासनादीनाम् । अतः सिद्धान्याश्रमान्तराणि । सर्वेषां चाधिकारो विद्यायाम् , परं च श्रेयः केवलाया विद्याया एवेति सिद्धम्

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

for (as a matter of fact) noninjury, celibacy, etc. are aids to enlightenment; **and hearing, reflecting upon, and meditating (contemplating) are the direct causes of it.** Hereby is established the need of other stages of life, and it is also **proved that people in all the stages of life can aspire for knowledge, and that the supreme goal is attainable through knowledge alone.**

उपासनं नाम उपास्यार्थवादे यथा देवतादिस्वरूपं श्रुत्या ज्ञाप्यते तथा मनसोपगम्य, आसनं चिन्तनम् , लौकिकप्रत्ययाव्यवधानेन, यावत् तद्देवतादिस्वरूपात्माभिमानाभिव्यक्तिरिति लौकिकात्माभिमानवत् ; – 'देवो भूत्वा देवानप्येतिऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । १ । २) 'किन्देवतोऽस्यां प्राच्यां दिश्यसिऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ९ । २०) इत्येवमादिश्रुतिभ्यः

Br.Up. 1.3.9 Bh.

Meditation (upāsanaṃ) is mentally approaching the form of the deity or the like as it is presented by the eulogistic portions of the Vedas relating to the objects of meditation, and concentrating on it, eliminating conventional notions, till one is as completely identified

with it as with one's body, conventionally regarded as oneself. Compare such Śruti passages as, 'Being a god, he attains the gods' (IV. i. 2), and 'What deity are you identified with in the east?' (III. ix. 20).

Section 179

References:

श्रोतव्यः पूर्वम् आचार्यत आगमतश्च ; पश्चान्मन्तव्यः तर्कतः ; ततो निदिध्यासितव्यः निश्चयेन ध्यातव्यः । एवं ह्यसौ दृष्टो भवति श्रवणमननिदिध्यासनसाधनैर्निर्वर्तितैः । यदा एकत्वमेतान्युपगतानि, तदा सम्यग्दर्शनं ब्रह्मैकत्वविषयं प्रसीदति, न अन्यथा श्रवणमात्रेण

Br.Up. 2.4.5 Bh.

It should first be heard of from a teacher and from the scriptures, then reflected on through reasoning, and then steadfastly meditated upon. Thus, only is It realised – when these means, viz. hearing, reflection and contemplation, have been gone through. When these three are combined (unified), then only true realisation of the unity of Brahman is accomplished, not otherwise – by (merely) hearing alone.

Note: (Only if all these three aspects of

direct spiritual practices are reconciled (all of them become one-pointed, fully in agreement), the Samyag-Darshana (the final, consummate Intuition) of the essence of the Absolute, non-dual Brahman-Atman Consciousness will accrue).

आत्मनि खलु अरे मैत्रेयि दृष्टे ; कथं दृष्ट आत्मनीति, उच्यते – पूर्वम् आचार्यागमाभ्यां श्रुते, पुनः तर्केणोपपत्त्या मते विचारिते, श्रवणं तु आगममात्रेण, मते उपपत्त्या, पश्चात् विज्ञाते – एवमेतत् नान्यथेति निर्धारिते ; किं भवतीत्युच्यते – इदं विदितं भवति ; इदं सर्वमिति यत् आत्मनोऽन्यत् , आत्मव्यतिरेकेणाभावात्

Br.Up. 4.5.6 Bh.

When the Self, dear Maitreyi, is perceived' How? This is being explained. By hearing first from the teacher and the scriptures, and then thinking it out to the logical effect through reasoning – the hearing is only through the scriptures (with the grace of the teacher) and the thinking through reasoning – and meditating thereafter upon it that is to say, knowing or ascertaining it to be definitely such and such and not to be anything else. What follows then? All this, that is different from the Self becomes known, for there is nothing apart from the Self.

ननु विप्रतिषिद्धम् – 'न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः (बृ। उ। ३ । ४ । २) इति श्रुतेः – विज्ञातुर्विज्ञानम् । न, एवं विज्ञानान्न विप्रतिषेधः ; एवं दृष्टेर्द्रष्टेति विज्ञायत एव ; अन्यज्ञानानपेक्षत्वाच्च – न च द्रष्टुर्नित्यैव दृष्टिरित्येवं विज्ञाते द्रष्टृविषयां दृष्टिमन्यामाकाङ्क्षते ; निवर्तते हि द्रष्टृविषयदृष्ट्याकाङ्क्षा तदसम्भवादेव ; न ह्यविद्यमाने विषये आकाङ्क्षा कस्यचिदुपजायते ; न च दृश्या दृष्टिर्द्रष्टारं विषयीकर्तुमुत्सहते, यतस्तामाकाङ्क्षेत ; न च स्वरूपविषयाकाङ्क्षा स्वस्यैव

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: But knowing the knower is selfcontradictory, for the Sruti says, 'One should not try to know the knower of knowledge' (III. iv. 2).

Reply: No, this sort of knowledge involves no contradiction. The Self is indeed known thus, as 'the seer of sight.' Also, it does not depend on any other knowledge. He who knows that the vision of the seer is eternal, does not wish to see It in any other way. This wish to see the seer automatically stops because of its very impossibility, for nobody hankers after a thing that does not exist. And that sight which is itself an object of vision does not dare to visualise the seer; in which case one might wish to do it. Nor does anybody want to see himself.

Section 180

References:

द्रष्टव्यादि-शब्दा अपि परविद्याधिकारपठिताः । तत्त्वाभिमुखीकरण-प्रधानाः, न तत्त्वावबोधविधि-प्रधाना भवन्ति । लोकेऽपि - इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णयेति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु । प्रणिधानमात्रं कुर्वित्युच्यते । न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुर्विति । ज्ञेयाभिमुखस्यापि । ज्ञानं कदाचिज्जायते, कदाचिन्न जायते । तस्मात् तं प्रति ज्ञानविषय एव दर्शयितव्यो ज्ञापयितुकामेन । तस्मिन्दर्शिते । स्वयमेव यथा-विषयं यथा-प्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते

BSBh. 3.2.21

So, words such as "Ātmā should be seen etc." used in the chapter dealing with Brahma-Vidyā also would not have the purport of an injunction to realize the truth. But would be for the purpose of bringing a person face to face with the Truth (Tattva) i.e. Brahman.
Even in the ordinary world, directions such as 'see this', 'listen to this' are only meant to imply, that one should give one's attention (to what is being said), and there is no direct injunction that one should actually attain any knowledge. Even when a person is face to face with any object of knowledge, such knowledge may, or perhaps may not, supervene. And therefore, one who intends to impart such knowledge need only indicate the object of knowledge to him and when once that is so

indicated. Knowledge supervenes in proportion to the nature of the object of knowledge (according to whether it is gross or subtle), and in proportion to the capacity of the means of proof.

ज्ञानं तु प्रमाण-जन्यं । यथाभूत-विषयं च । न तत् नियोगशतेनापि कारयितुं शक्यते । न च प्रतिषेधशतेनापि वारयितुं शक्यते । न हि तत् पुरुष-तन्त्रम् । वस्तु-तन्त्रमेव हि तत् । अतोऽपि नियोगाभावः

BSBh. 3.2.21

Knowledge as such, on the other hand, is generated by the means of proof, and is faithful to the object (of knowledge) as it is. **It can never be produced by even a hundred injunctions, nor can it ever be prevented from arising even by a hundred prohibitions also, It does not depend upon a man, but depends merely on the existing thing itself.** Hence also, there is absence of any injunction (as to the knowledge of Brahman).

न, दर्शन-पर्यवसानत्वाद् एषाम् । दर्शन-पर्यवसानानि हि श्रवणादीन् यावत्यमानानि दृष्टार्थानि भवन्ति - यथा अवघातादीनि तण्डुलादि-निष्पत्तिपर्यवसानानि, तद्वत्

BSBh. 4.1.1

No, because they (i.e. such mental acts) are meant ultimately to culminate in the intuitive realization (of Brahman). It is only when they so culminate in such intuitive realization (of Brahman) by such repeated hearing etc. that they have their tangible fruit, just as the

threshing of rice (which has its husk on it) has its culmination in the dehusking of such rice grains.

स सर्वांश्च लोकानाप्नोति सर्वांश्च कामान् । यः तमात्मानं यथोक्तेन प्रकारेण शास्त्राचार्योपदेशेन अन्विष्य विजानाति स्वसंवेद्यतामापादयति, तस्य एतत्सर्वलोककामावाप्तिः सर्वात्मता फलं भवतीति ह किल प्रजापतिरुवाच । अन्वेष्टव्यः विजिज्ञासितव्य इति च एष नियमविधिरेव, न अपूर्वविधिः । एवमन्वेष्टव्यो विजिज्ञासितव्य इत्यर्थः, दृष्टार्थत्वादन्वेषणविजिज्ञासनयोः । दृष्टार्थत्वं च दर्शयिष्यति 'नाहमत्र भोग्यं पश्यामि' (छा। उ। ८ । ९ । १), (छा। उ। ८ । १० । २), (छा। उ। ८ । ११ । २) इत्यनेन असकृत् । पररूपेण च देहादिधर्मैरवगम्यमानस्य आत्मनः स्वरूपाधिगमे विपरीताधिगमनिवृत्तिर्दृष्टं फलमिति नियमार्थतैव अस्य विधेर्युक्ता, न त्वग्निहोत्रादीनामिव अपूर्वविधित्वमिह सम्भवति

Chand.Up. 8.7.1 Bh.

He attains all the worlds, and all the desires. For him is the attainment of all the desires and all the worlds who having known this Self as described, through the means as instructed by the scriptures and teachers; makes It an object of his own realization, i.e., the result comes in the form of becoming the Self of all. Thus spoke Prajapati. This injunction (in the two phrases) 'It is to be known' and It is to be enquired in to for realization', is a regulative one (for a perceptible result). and not a fresh one (for apurva, an unseen result). The meaning is that It is to be known and enquired into in this way, because

the result of knowing It and enquiring into It for realization is a perceptible one. By saying again and again, 'I do not find any enjoyment here', the Upanisad will show that the result is a perceptible one. The perceptible result is the cessation of the contrary comprehension of the Self as characterised by the qualities of the body, on the comprehension of Its true nature. And this cessation is a perceptible result. Hence it is proper to say that this injunction has a regulatory purpose, but it is not possible here to have a fresh injunction (for an unseen result) as in the case of Agnihotra sacrifice etc.

Section 181

References:

अपि च उपासनं निदिध्यासनं च इत्यन्तर्णीतावृत्तिगुणैव क्रिया अभिधीयते ; तथा हि लोके 'गुरुमुपास्तेऽ 'राजानमुपास्तेऽ इति च यस्तात्पर्येण गुर्वादीननुवर्तते, स एवमुच्यते ; तथा 'ध्यायति प्रोषितनाथा पतिम्ऽ इति – या निरन्तरस्मरणा पतिं प्रति सोत्कण्ठा, सा एवमभिधीयते । विद्युपास्त्योश्च वेदान्तेषु अव्यतिरेकेण प्रयोगो दृश्यते ; क्वचित् विदिनोपक्रम्य उपासिनोपसंहरति, यथा – 'यस्तद्वेद यत्स वेद स मयैतदुक्तःऽ (छा। उ। ४ । १ । ४) इत्यत्र 'अनु म एतां भगवो देवतां शाधि यां देवतामुपास्सेऽ (छा। उ। ४ । २ । २) इति ; क्वचिच्च उपासिनोपक्रम्य विदिनोपसंहरति, यथा – 'मनो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीतऽ (छा।

उ। ३ । १८ । १) इत्यत्र 'भाति च तपति च कीर्त्या यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन य एवं वेदऽ (छा। उ। ३ । १८ । ३) इति । तस्मात्सकृदुपदेशेष्वपि आवृत्तिसिद्धिः । असकृदुपदेशस्तु आवृत्तेः सूचकः

BSBh. 4.1.1

Besides 'cogitation and meditation' are said to imply action in which this aspect of repetition (Āvṛtti-guṇa) is implicit. For instance, in ordinary life when we say that a man worships his preceptor or his king, we understand that it means that he serves his preceptor or his king with continued unswerving loyalty (Tāt-paryeṇa). Similarly, it is only when a Proṣita-nāthā wife (a grass widow i.e. a wife whose husband has gone away on business) constantly remembers her absent husband and is eager to meet him, that we speak of her (i.e. such traveller's wife) that she has no other thought but that of thinking constantly and wistfully remembering her absent husband. It is seen that the terms 'he should know', 'he should meditate' are used in Vedānta texts without any distinction i.e. as synonymous. In some places a Scriptural statement begins with the term 'let him know' and concludes with 'let him meditate upon'. As for instance in – "He who knows in the same manner in which he (Raikva) knows it (earns the same fruit which Raikva earned). It is of him that I have spoken (to you)" (Chan.Up .4.1.4), And "Oh Bhagavān, teach me about the deity on which you meditate" (Chan.Up. 4.2.2). Elsewhere,

the scriptures begin with ‘meditating’ and conclude with ‘knowing’ as for instance in – “Meditate on the mind as Brahman” (Chan.Up. 3.18.1), And “He who knows it to be so, shines and radiates with the heat of his fame, success, and strength, obtained through the knowledge of Brahman” (Chan.Up. 3.18.3). Thus, it is established, that repetition is necessary even when instruction is given only once, while several instructions of course suggest repetition (of such mental acts).

भवेदावृत्त्यानर्थक्यं तं प्रति, यः ‘तत्त्वमसि’ (छन्।उप्।६।८।७) इति सकृदुक्तमेव ब्रह्मात्मत्वमनुभवितुं शक्नुयात् । यस्तु न शक्नोति, तं प्रति उपयुज्यत एव आवृत्तिः

BSBh. 4.1.2

that **repetition may well be purposeless in the case of one, who, when the passage “That thou art” is addressed to him only once, is able to realize that Brahman is the Self (of all) but to one who is not so able to realize, repetition is useful.**

ननु उक्तम् - सकृच्छ्रुतं चेत् तत्त्वमसिवाक्यं स्वमर्थमनुभावयितुं न शक्नोति । तत आवर्त्यमानमपि नैव शक्ष्यतीति - नैष दोषः; न हि दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नं नाम । दृश्यन्ते हि सकृच्छ्रुताद्वाक्यात् मन्दप्रतीतं वाक्यार्थं आवर्तयन्तः तत्तदाभासव्युदासेन सम्यक्प्रतिपद्यमानाः । अपि च ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येतद्वाक्यं त्वंपदार्थस्य तत्पदार्थभावमाचष्टे

BSBh. 4.1.2

Opponent: If the passage “That thou art”, heard but once only, is unable to make one realize that which it means, then it certainly would not be able to do so even when it is repeated.

Reply: This is no fault, for, indeed, when a thing (such as repetition) is seen to be useful how can it be said that it is not reasonably sustainable. **It is indeed seen, that those who are able to understand the meaning of a sentence but vaguely by hearing it once only, are able to understand its meaning correctly, by a progressive removal of misconceptions (as to its meaning), by repetition**. Besides, the sentence “That thou art” speaks of the entity denoted by the word ‘thou’ as being identical with the entity denoted by the word ‘That’.

तत्र येषाम् एतौ पदार्थौ अज्ञानसंशयविपर्यय-प्रतिबद्धौ, तेषां । ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येतद्वाक्यं स्वार्थे प्रमां नोत्पादयितुं शक्नोति, पदार्थज्ञान-पूर्वकत्वाद् वाक्यार्थज्ञानस्य - इत्यतः, तान्प्रति एष्टव्यः पदार्थविवेक-प्रयोजनः शास्त्रयुक्त्यभ्यासः । यद्यपि च प्रतिपत्तव्य आत्मा निरंशः । तथापि अध्यारोपितं तस्मिन् बहवंशत्वं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिविषय-वेदनादि-लक्षणम् । तत्र एकेन अवधानेन एकमंशमपोहति । अपरेण अपरम् - इति युज्यते तत्र क्रमवती प्रतिपत्तिः । तत्तु पूर्वरूपमेव आत्मप्रतिपत्तेः । येषां पुनः निपुणमतीनां न अज्ञानसंशय-विपर्ययलक्षणः पदार्थविषयः प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति । ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थम् अनुभवितुमिति, तान्प्रति आवृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव

BSBh. 4.1.2

Now, in the case of those whose comprehension of the meaning of these two terms is obstructed, i.e., coloured by ignorance, doubt, and confusion, the sentence “That thou art” is unable to generate appropriate knowledge of what these words mean, **because the knowledge of the meaning of all the words (of a sentence), is a pre-requisite for the knowledge of the meaning of such a sentence. And hence in their case, the repetition of the study of scriptural passages and reasoning, which results in the proper discrimination of the words, is necessary**. Even though, the Self which is to be realized, does not consist of any parts as such still the nature of consisting of such parts as are characterized by a body, the sense-organs, mind, intelligence, objects of sense, and the property of reacting to pleasure and pain, is superimposed on it. And in such a case, inasmuch as one mental act of intentness of attention removes the misconception about one such part, and another such mental act of intentness of attention removes the misconception about another such part, and so on. It is but proper that in such a case, realization comes about by progressive stages, but even that is but only a one before the last condition of the actual realization of the Self. But such clever minds, as are not subject to any such impediments of the nature of ignorance, doubt, and confusion, as to the meaning of words, are able to

understand the meaning of the passage “That thou art” even though it is mentioned but once only.

Section 182

References:

तत्र यदि तावद्विद्यमानोऽयं प्रपञ्चः देहादिलक्षण आध्यात्मिकः बाह्यश्च । पृथिव्यादिलक्षणः प्रविलापयितव्य इत्युच्यते । स पुरुषमात्रेणाशक्यः प्रविलापयितुमिति । तत्प्रविलयोपदेशोऽशक्यविषय एव स्यात् । एकेन च आदिमुक्तेन पृथिव्यादिप्रविलयः कृत इति । इदानीं पृथिव्यादिशून्यं जगदभविष्यत् । अथ अविद्याध्यस्तो ब्रह्मण्येकस्मिन् अयं प्रपञ्चो विद्यया प्रविलाप्यत इति ब्रूयात् ।

ततो ब्रह्मैव अविद्याध्यस्त-प्रपञ्चप्रत्याख्यानेन आवेदयितव्यम्

‘एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म’ ‘तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि’ (छन्।उप्।६।८।७) इति - तस्मिन्नावेदिते, विद्या स्वयमेवोत्पद्यते । तया च अविद्या बाध्यते, ततश्च अविद्याध्यस्तः सकलोऽयं नामरूपप्रपञ्चः स्वप्नप्रपञ्चवत् प्रविलीयते -

BSBh. 3.2.21

Now, with regard to that, if it be maintained (by the opponent of Vedānta), that this actually existing variety of worldly manifestations of Ādhyātmika nature such as a body etc., and the actually existing variety of external manifestations such as this world etc., have to be dissolved, then, as it would be impossible for a man as

such, so to dissolve them. Any such instruction to dissolve them would be with regard to something having the nature of an impossibility. And assuming that it is possible for a man to do so, and assuming also that the very first person who has attained liberation must have already dissolved this earth etc. Then this universe must indeed now be devoid of this world etc. (which it actually is not). If it be said that this variety of worldly manifestations superimposed on the one and only one Brahman through ignorance, is to be dissolved by means of knowledge. Then it would merely suffice to make a person understand Brahman, by merely indicating it and denying the truth of the variety of worldly manifestations superimposed on it by ignorance, by means of such scriptural passages as “Brahman is the only one without a second”, “That is the Truth, the Ātmā, that thou art” (Chan.Up. 6.8.7), and when that is made known, knowledge (Vidyā) would spring up of itself and counteract ignorance, and the variety of worldly manifestations of names and forms would melt away like the variety of worldly manifestations in a dream.

नन्वावेदिते ब्रह्मणि तद्विज्ञान-विषयः प्रपञ्चविलय-विषयो वा नियोगः स्यात् । न, निष्प्रपञ्च-ब्रह्मात्मत्वावेदनेनैव । उभयसिद्धेः - रज्जुस्वरूप-प्रकाशनेनैव हि । तत्स्वरूप-विज्ञानम् अविद्याध्यस्तसर्पादि-प्रपञ्चप्रविलयश्च भवति । न च कृतमेव पुनः क्रियते

BSBh. 3.2.21

Opponent: But such injunction may well relate to the act of knowing the nature of Brahman or to the dissolution of the variety of worldly manifestations, when the scriptures have once made Brahman known.

Reply: No, it is merely by making a person realize (on the authority of the scriptures) that **Brahman is devoid of any variety of worldly manifestation.** That both these (i.e. the knowledge of Brahman and the dissolution of the variety of worldly manifestations) are simultaneously attained. It is merely by displaying the true nature of a rope that both the knowledge of a rope as a rope and the dissolution of the snake etc., superimposed on it by ignorance, is simultaneously accomplished. What is done once, is never done again.

नियोज्योऽपि च प्रपञ्चावस्थायां योऽवगम्यते जीवो नाम । स प्रपञ्चपक्षस्यैव वा स्यात् । ब्रह्मपक्षस्यैव वा । प्रथमे विकल्पे । निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मतत्त्व-प्रतिपादनेन । पृथिव्यादिवत् जीवस्यापि प्रविलापितत्वात् । कस्य प्रपञ्चविलये नियोग उच्येत । कस्य वा

नियोगनिष्ठतया मोक्षोऽवाप्तव्य उच्येत ? द्वितीयेऽपि । ब्रह्मैव अनियोज्यस्वभावं जीवस्य स्वरूपम्, जीवत्वं तु अविद्याकृतमेव - इति प्रतिपादिते ब्रह्मणि नियोज्याभावात् । नियोगाभाव एव

BSBh. 3.2.21

Now (we ask), does this Jīva-Self which is supposed to be the object of such an injunction, during the Jīva-Self's condition of phenomenal existence belong to the phenomenal world, or is it Brahman itself? As regards the first alternative – By the expounding of the truth of Brahman as being an entity devoid of the variety of worldly manifestations along with the dissolution of the world, the Jīva-Self itself also will have been dissolved and then, to whom, can this injunction to dissolve the variety of worldly manifestations, be given and who, by faithfully obeying such an injunction, could you possibly say, would have to attain liberation? As regards the second alternative, when Brahman has been expounded thus – viz. that Brahman which cannot possibly be the object of an injunction, is itself the real nature of the Jīva-Self, and that the phenomenal condition of the Jīva-Self is caused by ignorance, – Then by reason of the absence of any entity to whom such an injunction can possibly be given there would be the absence of any such injunction itself.

किञ्चान्यत् - नियोग-निष्ठतयैव पर्यवस्यत्याम्नाये । यदभ्युपगतम् अनियोज्य-ब्रह्मात्मत्वं जीवस्य । तत् अप्रमाणकमेव स्यात् । अथ शास्त्रमेव अनियोज्य-ब्रह्मात्मत्वमाचक्षीत । तदवबोधे च पुरुषं नियुञ्जीत । ततो ब्रह्मशास्त्रस्यैकस्य द्व्यर्थपरता विरुद्धार्थपरता च प्रसज्येयाताम्

BSBh. 3.2.21

Moreover, were the aim of the scriptures to be to culminate merely in injunctions only, then, what has so far been understood, viz. that the Jīva-Self is nothing else but Brahman, about which there could be no injunction would be rendered unauthoritative. Now, if the Śāstra itself were to speak about Brahman as being one which cannot be an object of an injunction and at the same time, were it to enjoin a person to understand it then in that case, one and the same Brahma-Śāstra would have a double and a mutually contradictory significance.

नियोगपरतायां च । श्रुतहानिः अश्रुतकल्पना कर्मफलवत् मोक्षस्य अदृष्टफलत्वम् अनित्यत्वं च - इति एवमादयो दोषा न केनचित्परिहर्तुं शक्याः

BSBh. 3.2.21

Now, supposing the scriptures were to give injunctions only, it would not be possible for anybody to obviate such faults as would necessarily arise,

viz., the abandonment of what the scriptures have declared, and the acceptance of what they have not declared, snd it would also mean, that Final Release also, like the fruit of actions, is the fruit of an unseen principle (Adṛṣṭa) and is non-permanent.

तत्रैवं सति यथाभूत-ब्रह्मात्मविषयमपि ज्ञानं न चोदनातन्त्रम् । तद्विषये लिङादयः श्रूयमाणा अपि अनियोज्यविषयत्वात् कुण्ठीभवन्ति उपलादिषु प्रयुक्तक्षुर-तैक्ष्ण्यादिवत्, अहेयानुपादेय-वस्तुविषयत्वात्
BSBh. 1.1.4

This being so, **the knowledge that the eternally existing Brahman is the Self, is not something which depends upon an injunction.** So Brahman not being the object of an injunction, or not being an entity from which any thing can be discarded or to which any thing can be added, any imperative forms (of verbs) we see used in the scriptures, become as ineffective as when the sharp edge of a razor is employed on a stone.

यदप्युक्तम् – कर्तव्यविध्यनुप्रवेशम् अन्तरेण वस्तुमात्रम् उच्यमानम् अनर्थकं स्यात् 'सप्तद्वीपा वसुमती' इत्यादिवदिति, तत्परिहृतम् । 'रज्जुरियम्, नायं सर्पः' इति वस्तुमात्रकथनेऽपि प्रयोजनस्य दृष्टत्वात् । ननु श्रुतब्रह्मणोऽपि यथापूर्वं संसारित्वदर्शनान्न रज्जुस्वरूप-कथनवद् अर्थवत्त्वम् इत्युक्तम् ।
अत्रोच्यते – नावगतब्रह्मात्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम् । वेदप्रमाणजनित-ब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्
BSBh. 1.1.4

Then with regard also to what has been said, viz. that the mention of actually existing entities which do not lead up to some sort of injunction to action, is purposeless like such sentences as 'the world is comprised of seven islands', it has been refuted. Because it has been seen that a fruit does accrue by the mere mention of such an entity, thus – 'This is a rope and not a snake'.
Opponent: But I have said already that as it is seen that even in the case of a person who has received instruction about Brahman, he is still seen to continue to be in the same transmigratory condition, the scriptural passages have no such meaning as there is in mentioning that this is a rope and not a snake.
Reply: **It is not possible to show that he who has once understood the condition of the Self's unity (identity) with Brahman, still continues to be affected by the transmigratory condition**. Because it is contradictory to the condition of the unity of the Self with Brahman achieved on Scriptural authority.

Section 183

References:

यत्पुनरुक्तं श्रवणात्पराचीनयोर्मननननिदिध्यासनयोर्दर्शनाद्विधिशेषत्वं ब्रह्मणः, न स्वरूपपर्यवसायित्वमिति, तन्न ;

श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वान्मननिदिध्यासनयोः । यदि ह्यवगतं ब्रह्मान्यत्र विनियुज्येत, भवेत्तदा विधिशेषत्वम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Again with regard to what was said, viz., that because it is observed that further cogitation and meditation should follow the hearing of Brahman, Brahman is merely complementary to an injunction and its knowledge does not culminate in the realization of its own nature. If Brahman after being fully realized were to be employed elsewhere (for some other purpose) then it would very well happen to be complementary to an injunction. But it is not so, because (as said above) **reflection and contemplation also, like hearing, are meant ultimately to culminate in the complete realization (of Brahman).**

तस्मात् अहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्येतदवसाना एव सर्वे विधयः सर्वाणि चेतराणि प्रमाणानि

BSBh. 1.1.4

Therefore, all injunctions and all other means of knowledge are valid only upto the realization thus – "I am Brahman".

Section 184

References:

इदानीं योगस्य यत् फलं ब्रह्मैकत्व-दर्शनं सर्व-संसार-विच्छेद-कारणं तत् प्रदर्श्यते - सर्वभूतस्थं सर्वेषु भूतेषु स्थितं स्वम् आत्मानं सर्वभूतानि च आत्मनि ब्रह्मादीनि स्तम्बपर्यन्तानि च सर्वभूतानि आत्मनि एकतां गतानि ईक्षते पश्यति योगयुक्तात्मा समाहितान्तःकरणः सर्वत्र समदर्शनः सर्वेषु ब्रह्मादिस्थावरान्तेषु विषमेषु सर्वभूतेषु समं निर्विशेषं ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविषयं दर्शनं ज्ञानं यस्य स सर्वत्र समदर्शनः

BGh. 6.29

Now is being shown that result of Yoga which is the realization of identity with Brahman and which is the cause of the extinction of the whole mundane existence. One who has his mind Self-absorbed through Yoga, whose mind is merged in samadhi [Intuitive contemplation] and who has the vision of sameness everywhere, who has the vision (darsana) of sameness (samatva), the knowledge of identity of the Self and Brahman everywhere (sarvatra) without exception, in all divergent objects beginning from Brahma to immovable things, sees the Self, his own Self, existing in everything; and everything from Brahma to a clump of grass; unified in his Self.

तं पुराणं पुरातनम् अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन विषयेभ्यः प्रतिसंहृत्य चेतस आत्मनि समाधानमध्यात्मयोगः तस्याधिगमः प्राप्तिः तेन मत्वा देवम् आत्मानं धीरः हर्षशोकौ आत्मन उत्कर्षापकर्षयोरभावात् जहाति

Kath.Up. 1.2.12 Bh.

Having withdrawn the mind from the sensory objects, fixing, it in concentration on the Self, and thus knowing (realizing) th Deity, i.e., the Self that is ancient, (through such means as Adhyatmayoga), the intelligent man abandons joy and grief, for the Self has neither superiority nor inferiority (ātmana utkarṣāpakarṣayorabhāvāt).

तस्य च अपर-ब्रह्मोपासनस्य । तत्सन्निधौ श्रूयमाणम् 'स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति' (छन्।उप्।८।२।१) इत्यादि जगदैश्वर्य-लक्षणं संसार-गोचरमेव फलं भवति, अनिवर्तितत्वाद् अविद्यायाः । तस्य च देशविशेषावबद्धत्वात् । तत्प्राप्त्यर्थं गमनमविरुद्धम्

BSBh. 4.3.14

Of the meditation on the Lower Brahman, there is the fruit,
as mentioned in the scriptural passage "If he is desirous of the world of the manes" (Chan.Up. 8.2.1), which is characterized by Lordship over the earth, and which is available in this transmigratory existence, because of the ignorance (of one who knows qualified Brahman only) not having been yet removed. As such fruit is confined to a

particular environment, a movement for the attainment of it, is not contradictory.

शरीरे पतितेऽशरीरत्वं स्यात्, न जीवत इति चेत् । न सशरीरत्वस्य मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तत्वात् । न ह्यात्मनः शरीरात्माभिमानलक्षणं मिथ्याज्ञानं मुक्त्वा अन्यतः सशरीरत्वं शक्यं कल्पयितुम्

BSBh. 1.1.4

Objection: If it be objected, that disembodiedness supervenes after the body falls (i.e., when a person dies), and not while a person continues to live,

Reply: No, because the embodied condition itself is caused by wrong knowledge (ignorance). In the case of the Self it is not possible to conceive of any corporeality for the Self, otherwise than by the wrong knowledge (ignorance) of the nature of the vanity of the Self being possessed of a body.

तदेष श्लोको भवति । यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः । अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुत इति । तद्यथाहिनिर्ल्वयनी वल्मीके मृता प्रत्यस्ता शयीतैवमेवेदं शरीरं शेतेऽथायमशरीरोऽमृतः प्राणो ब्रह्मैव तेज एव सोऽहं भगवते सहस्रं ददामीति होवाच जनको वैदेहः

Br.Up. 4.7.7 (sruti)

Regarding this there is this verse: ‘When all the desires that dwell in his heart (mind) are gone, then he, having been mortal, becomes immortal, and attains Brahman in this very body.’ Just as the lifeless slough of a snake is cast off and lies in the anthill, so does this body lie.

Then the self becomes disembodied and immortal, (becomes) the Prāṇa (Supreme Self), Brahman, the Light. 'I give you a thousand (cows), sir,' said Janaka, Emperor of Videha.

आत्मसत्यानुबोधेन न सङ्कल्पयते यदा । अमनस्तां तदा याति ग्राह्याभावे तदग्रहम्

Ma.Up.Ka. 3.32 (Karika)

When the mind does not imagine on account of the knowledge of the Truth which is Ātman, then it ceases to be mind and becomes free from all idea of cognition, for want of objects to be cognised.

'सङ्कल्पादेवास्य पितरः समुत्तिष्ठन्ति' (छन्।उप्।८।२।१) इत्यतः श्रुतेः । मनः तावत् सङ्कल्प-साधनं सिद्धम् । शरीरेन्द्रियाणि पुनः प्राप्तैश्वर्यस्य विदुषः सन्ति, न वा सन्ति - इति समीक्ष्यते

BSBh. 4.4.10

Because of the scriptural statement "By mere volition alone his manes appear (before him)" (Chan.Up. 8.2.1) etc., the existence of the mind at least, as a means of volition, is proved. It is now being considered whether a person who has attained liberation and has acquired lordly power, possesses a body and sense-organs.

बादरायणः पुनराचार्यः अत एव उभय-लिङ्गश्रुतिदर्शनात् उभयविधत्वं साधु मन्यते - यदा सशरीरतां सङ्कल्पयति तदा सशरीरो भवति, यदा तु अशरीरतां तदा अशरीर इति

BSBh. 4.4.12

Ācārya Bādarāyaṇa again considers this two-fold condition to be proper, because it is seen that there are indicatory marks of both the kinds viz., that he becomes embodied or disembodied, just as he desires to have such a body or desires to be without such a body.

स्थितमेतत् । 'स्वेन रूपेण' (छन्।उप्। ८।३।४) इत्यत्र - आत्ममात्र-रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते । न आगन्तुकेनापर-रूपेणेति । अधुना तु तद्विशेषबुभुत्सायाम् । अभिधीयते -
स्वम् अस्य रूपं ब्राह्मम् अपहतपाप्मत्वादि-सत्यसङ्कल्पत्वावसानं तथा सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वेश्वरत्वं च, तेन स्वरूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यत इति जैमिनिराचार्यो मन्यते

BSBh. 4.4.5

It is now settled that the Jīva-Self, according to the scriptural statement "In its own Atmic nature" (Chan.Up. 8.3.4), manifests itself only in the form of the Supreme Self and not in any other adventitious lower (Apara) form. Now, when the desire is to know the particular speciality of the form. It is stated (by the Sūtrakāra)
that Ācārya Jaimini is of opinion that it manifests itself In its own Brahmic form (comprising of the whole gamut of attributes). Beginning with the nature of being free from all sin, and ending with the attribute of having true

desires, as also (the attributes) of omniscience and lordship over all.

चैतन्यमेव तु अस्य आत्मनः स्वरूपमिति तन्मात्रेण स्वरूपेण अभिनिष्पत्तिर्युक्ता ; तथा च श्रुतिः 'एवं वा अरेऽयमात्मानन्तरोऽबाह्यः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एवऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । १३) इत्येवंजातीयका अनुगृहीता भविष्यति ; सत्यकामत्वादयस्तु यद्यपि वस्तुस्वरूपेणैव धर्मा उच्यन्ते – सत्याः कामा अस्येति, तथापि उपाधिसम्बन्धाधीनत्वात्तेषां न चैतन्यवत् स्वरूपत्वसम्भवः, अनेकाकारत्वप्रतिषेधात् ; प्रतिषिद्धं हि ब्रह्मणोऽनेकाकारत्वम् 'न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गम्ऽ (ब्र। सू। ३ । २ । ११) इत्यत्र । अत एव च जक्षणादिसङ्कीर्तनमपि दुःखाभावमात्राभिप्रायं स्तुत्यर्थम् 'आत्मरतिःऽ इत्यादिवत् । न हि मुख्यान्येव रतिक्रीडामिथुनानि आत्मनि शक्यन्ते वर्णयितुम् , द्वितीयविषयत्वात्तेषाम् । तस्मान्निरस्ताशेषप्रपञ्चेन प्रसन्नेन अव्यपदेश्येन बोधात्मना अभिनिष्पद्यत इत्यौडुलोमिराचार्यो मन्यते

BSBh. 4.4.6

While, inasmuch as, 'sentiency' alone is the nature of this Self, it is but logical that the manifestation (of the Jīva-Self) should be, merely in its own nature of sentiency. For even so it is, that the scriptural statements "Thus, oh (Maitreyī), this Self which has no inside or outside but which is wholly a solid mass of sentiency" (Br.Up. 4.5.13). Happen to be in consonance with the scriptures. Even though such attributes as "Having desires which are true etc." are spoken of as being the attributes of an

entity (dissolving the compound word ‘Satya-kāma’ as ‘he whose desires are true’). Yet, inasmuch as they are dependent upon contact with limiting adjuncts they cannot possibly be, like Sentiency, the Selfs own nature, because in the case of Brahman, there is a denial of its having more than one i.e. several aspects. In the case of Brahman, this i.e. its having more than one aspect is denied in Brahma Sutra 3.2.11. Hence, the mention about it of eating etc. is meant merely to convey the absence of any misery, for the purpose of glorification, as it is, in the attribute of ‘loving its own Self’ (Ātma-ratiḥ) etc. It is not possible to describe Brahman (alone by itself) as having the attributes of love, sport and love-play, in the principal meaning of the terms, as they presuppose the existence of two entitles. Therefore, Ācārya Auḍulomi is of opinion that the Jīva-Self manifests itself in a way in which all phenomenal duality is effaced from it, and that it is serene, and as one having a nature of serene sentiency, which is not possible of being indicated (by any term).

एवमपि पारमार्थिकचैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपाभ्युपगमेऽपि । व्यवहारापेक्षया पूर्वस्यापि उपन्यासादिभ्योऽवगतस्य ब्राह्मस्य ऐश्वर्यरूपस्य अप्रत्याख्यानाद् अविरोधं बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते

BSBh. 4.4.7

Even if it is understood that the Jīva-Self has this transcendental attribute of pure sentiency only, still, inasmuch as, considering the phenomenal point of view, it is not denied that the Jīva-Self still retains its previous attribute of possessing Lordly powers also, as understood from the Scriptures, Ācārya Bādarāyaṇa is of opinion that there is no contradiction.

जैमिनिस्त्वाचार्यः मनोवत् शरीरस्यापि सेन्द्रियस्य भावं मुक्तं प्रति मन्यते

BSBh. 4.4.11

Ācārya Jaimini is of opinion that a person who has attained liberation does possess a body together with the sense-organs quite as surely as the mind,

ये सगुण-ब्रह्मोपासनात् सहैव मनसा ईश्वर-सायुज्यं व्रजन्ति । किं तेषां निरवग्रहमैश्वर्यं भवति, आहोस्वित् सावग्रहमिति संशयः । किं तावत्प्राप्तम्?
निरङ्कुशमेव एषामैश्वर्यं भवितुमर्हति, 'आप्नोति स्वाराज्यम्' (तैत्।उप्।१।६।२)
'सर्वेऽस्मै देवा बलिमावहन्ति' (तैत्।उप्।१।५।३)
'तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति' (छनु।७।२५।२, छनु।८।१।६)
इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्य इति। एवं प्राप्ते, पठति - जगद्व्यापार-वर्जमिति । जगदुत्पत्त्यादि-व्यापारं वर्जयित्वा । अन्यत् अणिमाद्यात्मकमैश्वर्यं मुक्तानां भवितुमर्हति । जगद्व्यापारस्तु नित्य-सिद्धस्यैव ईश्वरस्य

BSBh. 4.4.17

Opponent: Now, with regard to those, who, through meditation on qualified Brahman, attain unity with the Lord, along with the mind, the doubt arises, whether they have unlimited power or have only a limited power. What then is the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta)? It is, that because of the scriptural passages “He attains the Self’s Lordship” (Tait.Up. 1.6.2), “All deities carry offerings to him” (Tait.Up. 1.5.3), “They move freely in all the worlds” (Chan.Up. 7.25.2, Chan.Up. 8.1.6), they deserve to have unlimited powers.

Reply: This being the conclusion. They have all the powers, barring that of the operation of running the world. Barring the creation etc. of the world, they deserve to possess all other powers, such as Aṇimā (the power to reduce oneself to the dimension of an atom) etc., the operation of running this world however being the exclusive power of the eternally perfect Lord.

आधिकारिको यः सवितृ-मण्डलादिषु विशेषायतनेष्ववस्थितः पर ईश्वरः, तदायत्तैव इयं स्वाराज्य-प्राप्तिरुच्यते

BSBh. 4.4.18

It is stated that the unity with the Self, attained (by the Jīva-Selfs), is dependent upon him who holds command over and resides in the particular abodes of the spheres of the Sun etc. (viz. the Highest Lord)

सगुण एवावतिष्ठन्ते । एवं सगुणेऽपि निरवग्रहमैश्वर्यमनवाप्य । सावग्रह एवावतिष्ठन्त इति द्रष्टव्यम्

BSBh. 4.4.19

They abide only in the qualified form, and similarly not having attained unlimited powers in the qualified form, they possess the limited powers only.

Section 185

References:

न हि कर्मबहुत्ववत् ब्रह्मबहुत्वमपि वेदान्तेषु प्रतिपिपादयिषितमिति शक्यं वक्तुम् । ब्रह्मण एकत्वात् एकरूपत्वाच्च । न च एकरूपे ब्रह्मणि अनेकरूपाणि विज्ञानानि सम्भवन्ति । न हि - अन्यथा अर्थः अन्यथा ज्ञानम् - इत्यभ्रान्तं भवति । यदि पुनः एकस्मिन्ब्रह्मणि बहूनि विज्ञानानि वेदान्तेषु प्रतिपिपादयिषितानि । तेषाम् एकमभ्रान्तम् । भ्रान्तानि इतराणीति । अनाश्वासप्रसङ्गो वेदान्तेषु

BSBh. 3.3.1

It is not possible to say, that in the Vedānta it is intended to expound, that just as there is a variety of religious actions, there are varieties of Brahman, because there is but one and only one Brahman and it is of one uniform nature. That there could be a variety in the nature of Vidyās in the case of Brahman which is of one uniform nature, is not possible. [Isn't it that-] if an entity is of one nature, and the knowledge of such entity is of a different nature, such knowledge can only be of

an illusory nature. Now, again Brahman being but one and one only, if different Vijñānas (i.e. Vidyās or Upāsanās or Cognitions) of it are intended to be expounded by the Vedānta texts, then only one of them could be free from doubt, and the rest would necessarily be doubtful, and thus the predicament of a distrust of the Vedānta texts would result.

आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य ब्रह्मणो धर्माः । सर्वे सर्वत्र प्रतिपत्तव्याः । कस्मात्? सर्वाभेदादेव - सर्वत्र हि तदेव एकं प्रधानं विशेष्यं ब्रह्म । न भिद्यते

BSBh. 3.3.11

All the attributes of Brahman i.e., the Chief entity, such as bliss etc., should be understood to belong to it everywhere. Whence is it so? Precisely because of non-difference. **Brahman**, the entity to which these attributes **belong, is one and the same Chief entity everywhere, and it does not differ**.

अक्षरविषयास्तु विशेषप्रतिषेध-बुद्धयः सर्वाः सर्वत्रावरोद्धव्याः । सामान्य-तद्भावाभ्याम् - समानो हि सर्वत्र विशेषनिराकरणरूपो ब्रह्मप्रतिपादन-प्रकारः । तदेव च सर्वत्र प्रतिपाद्यं ब्रह्म अभिन्नं प्रत्यभिज्ञायते । तत्र किमिति अन्यत्र कृता बुद्धयः अन्यत्र न स्युः । तथा च 'आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य' (ब्र्स्।३।३।११) इति अत्र व्याख्यातम् । तत्र विधि-रूपाणि विशेषणानि चिन्तितानि, इह प्रतिषेध-रूपाणीति विशेषः । प्रपञ्चार्थश्चायं चिन्ताभेदः

BSBh. 3.3.33

All special negative conceptions about the Imperishable one (Brahman) should all be understood as obtaining everywhere, because the Imperishable (Brahman) is common to all and the definitions are similar. The manner of **expounding Brahman which is of a nature involving denial of every special conception, is common everywhere.** The same identical Brahman is understood to be propounded everywhere, so why should such negative conceptions (about Brahman) referred to in one place, not be available in other places? It has been so explained in the Sūtra "Bliss etc. belong to the principal one (i.e., Brahman)" (Brahma Sutra 3.3.11). The distinction between the two is that special characteristics of a positive injunctional nature were considered there (i.e. in Brahma Sutra 3.3.11), while negative conceptions are considered here. This distinction between these two kinds of considerations is with a view to secure a detailed elaborate treatment (of Brahman).

स्थिते चैवं सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययत्वे सर्वविज्ञानानाम् । अन्यत्रोदितानां विज्ञान-गुणानाम् । अन्यत्रापि समाने विज्ञाने उपसंहारो भवति । अर्थाभेदात् -
य एव हि तेषां गुणानामेकत्र अर्थो विशिष्टविज्ञानोपकारः । स एव अन्यत्रापि । उभयत्रापि हि तदेवैकं विज्ञानम् । तस्मादुपसंहारः
BSBh. 3.3.5
It has been established that the Vidyās (Cognitions) in all the Vedānta texts are the same everywhere, (It follows that) the subsidiary matters of a Vidyā in one place are to be combined with the subsidiary matters of the same Vidyā in another place, because there is no difference in the fruit of the Vidyās (Cognitions) themselves. The use i.e. the benefit which the subsidiary matters relating to one Vidyā (Cognition) afford to that Vidyā is the same that they afford to another Vidyā, and, as the Vidyā is one and the same in both the places there is a combination (of the subsidiary matters of both).

Section 186

References:

मनोवृत्त्यर्थत्वाभेदेऽपि । अनुबन्धभेदाद् वेद्यभेदे सति । विद्याभेदोपपत्तेः । एकस्यापीश्वरस्य उपास्यस्य । प्रतिप्रकरणं व्यावृत्ता गुणाः शिष्यन्ते
BSBh. 3.3.58
Because, even though as meaning an activity or mode of the mind there is no difference (between them), still,

when a difference in the object of knowledge, resulting from a difference in connection, is present, separateness of the Vidyās (from each other) becomes reasonably sustainable. Even though the object of meditation, viz. the Lord, is one and the same (in all the Vidyās), the scriptures mention in each chapter, mutually exclusive and different attributes i.e., Guṇas (of the Lord).

विकल्प एव आसां भवितुमर्हति । न समुच्चयः । कस्मात्? अविशिष्ट-फलत्वात् ।
अविशिष्टं हि आसां फलम् उपास्यविषय-साक्षात्करणम् । एकेन च उपासनेन साक्षात्कृते उपास्ये विषये ईश्वरादौ । द्वितीयमनर्थकम् । अपि च असम्भव एव । साक्षात्करणस्य समुच्चय-पक्षे, चित्तविक्षेप-हेतुत्वात् । साक्षात्करण-साध्यं च विद्याफलं दर्शयन्ति श्रुतयः - 'यस्य स्याददधा न विचिकित्सास्ति' (छन्।उप्। ३।१४।४) इति, 'देवो भूत्वा देवानप्येति' (छन्।उप्। ४।१।२) इति च एवमाद्याः; स्मृतयश्च - 'सदा तद्भावभावितः' (ब्ग्। ८।६) इत्येवमाद्याः । तस्मात् अविशिष्ट-फलानां विद्यानाम् अन्यतमाम् आदाय तत्परः स्यात् ।
यावदुपास्यविषयसाक्षात्करणेन तत्फलं प्राप्तमिति

BSBh. 3.3.59

That they deserve to have an option and not that they must all be combined. Whence is it so? Because the fruit (of all) is the same, viz., the actual realization of the object of meditation. **When the object of meditation, such as the Lord, is actually realized by one Vidyā, the other is rendered purposeless.** Besides (such a view)

involves the non-possibility (of such realization). The view that all Vidyās may be collectively performed (by one man) for actual realization, would cause distraction of the mind. The scriptures indicate that the fruit of a Vidyā is secured by the actual realization (of the Lord), thus – He who has realized (the object of meditation) and who has no doubt left (realizes Brahman)" (Chan.Up. 3.14.4), "Having attained Godhood, he becomes absorbed in the Godhead" (Chan.Up. 4.1.2) etc. Similarly, the Smṛti passage "Who is always imbued with that faith" (BhG.8.6) etc. Therefore, **one should choose one out of the several Vidyās which have all one common fruit and perform it with undivided attention, till such fruit is obtained by the actual realization of the object of meditation**, (is the conclusion).

Section 187

References:

कर्माङ्गसम्बद्धेषु तावत् उपासनेषु कर्मतन्त्रत्वात् न आसनादिचिन्ता ; नापि सम्यग्दर्शने, वस्तुतन्त्रत्वाद्विज्ञानस्य ; इतरेषु तु उपासनेषु किम् अनियमेन तिष्ठन् आसीनः शयानो वा प्रवर्तेत उत नियमेन आसीन एवेति चिन्तयति । तत्र मानसत्वादुपासनस्य अनियमः शरीरस्थितेरित्येवं प्राप्ते, ब्रवीति – आसीन एवोपासीतेति । कुतः ? सम्भवात् । उपासनं नाम समानप्रत्ययप्रवाहकरणम् ; न च तत् गच्छतो

धावतो वा सम्भवति, गत्यादीनां चित्तविक्षेपकरत्वात् ; तिष्ठतोऽपि देहधारणे व्यापृतं मनो न सूक्ष्मवस्तुनिरीक्षणक्षमं भवति ; शयानस्यापि अकस्मादेव निद्रया अभिभूयते ; आसीनस्य तु एवंजातीयको भूयान्दोषः सुपरिहर इति सम्भवति तस्योपासनम्

BSBh. 4.1.7

There could be no question of the consideration about posture etc. in the case of meditations relating to the subordinate parts of religious actions, inasmuch as they are regulated by the religious actions themselves, nor can there be any such question in the case of the correct i.e. perfect intuitive knowledge (of an entity such as Brahman), as the knowledge of such an entity depends upon such intuitive knowledge of the entity itself. But with regard to other meditations, the Sūtrakāra now proceeds to consider, whether they should as a rule be performed in a sitting posture. Or whether a man should set about to perform them, regardless of any such rule, whether he be standing, sitting, or lying down, just as he pleases. With regard to this, the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta) is, that inasmuch as meditation is a mental act, there could be no rule with regard to the bodily posture. This being the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta) **the Sūtrakāra replies – A person should meditate in a sitting posture only**. Whence is it so? Because it is possible (only in that posture). **Meditation indeed is the setting up of a continuous stream of homogeneous**

mental apprehensions which is not possible when a person is either walking or running, as motion etc. of any kind are prone to distract the mind. In the case of a man standing also, inasmuch as the mind is preoccupied in maintaining the body in an erect posture, it is not capable of realizing a supersensuous entity. A man in a recumbent posture is prone to be suddenly overpowered by sleep. But, in the case of a man in a sitting posture, many such faults are easily avoidable. And meditation by him is thus possible.

स्मरन्त्यपि च शिष्टा उपासनाङ्गत्वेन आसनम् - 'शुचौ देशे प्रतिष्ठाप्य स्थिरमासनमात्मनः' (ब्ग्। ६।११) इत्यादिना । अत एव पद्मकादीनाम् आसनविशेषाणाम् उपदेशो योगशास्त्रे

BSBh. 4.1.10

The learned Smṛtikāras also speak of the sitting posture (Āsana) as a subordinate part of meditation, thus – "Having taken up a firm sitting posture for oneself in a hallowed place etc." (Gita 6.11). Hence also, the Yoga-Śāstra gives instructions about such special postures as Padmaka (the lotus posture – i.e. sitting, right foreleg on left thigh and left foreleg on right thigh).

दिग्देशकालेषु अर्थलक्षण एव नियमः । यत्रैव अस्य दिशि देशे काले वा मनसः सौकर्येणैकाग्रता भवति, तत्रैवोपासीत, प्राचीदिक्-पूर्वाह्ण-प्राचीनप्रवणादिवत् विशेषाश्रवणात्, एकाग्रताया इष्टायाः सर्वत्राविशेषात्

BSBh. 4.1.11

That a rule as to direction etc. in connection with the aim (of such meditation) does exist by implication, thus: – as there is no special scriptural mention about any rule about meditation, as there is in sacrifices etc., as regards the eastern direction, or forenoon, or a site sloping towards the east, one should perform **meditation wherever and in whichever direction, and whenever, concentration of mind can be secured with ease**, because such concentration of mind is possible anywhere.

Section 188

References:

तत्र यानि तावत् सम्यग्दर्शनार्थान्युपासनानि, तानि अवघातादिवत् कार्यपर्यवसानानीति । ज्ञातमेव एषाम् आवृत्तिपरिमाणम् । न हि सम्यग्दर्शने कार्ये निष्पन्ने यत्नान्तरं किञ्चिच्छासितुं शक्यम् । अनियोज्यब्रह्मात्मत्व-प्रतिपत्तेः शास्त्रस्याविषयत्वात्

BSBh. 4.1.12

So far as that is concerned, as such meditations for the purpose of correct i.e. perfect knowledge, should, as in the case of the pounding (of rice etc.), ultimately culminate in the achievement of the objective viz. correct

i.e. perfect knowledge. The extent of their repetition has of course been understood already. When the effect of meditation viz. **perfect knowledge, is achieved, it is not possible to enjoin any further effort (of meditation). Because, as Brahman is the Self of all and is not something which can be enjoined (on a man), it cannot be the province of a Śāstra.**

यानि पुनः अभ्युदयफलानि, तेष्वेषा चिन्ता – किं कियन्तंचित्कालं प्रत्ययमावर्त्य उपरमेत् , उत यावज्जीवमावर्तयेदिति । किं तावत्प्राप्तम् ? कियन्तंचित्कालं प्रत्ययमभ्यस्य उत्सृजेत् , आवृत्तिविशिष्टस्योपासनशब्दार्थस्य कृतत्वादित्येवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः – आ प्रायणादेव आवर्तयेत्प्रत्ययम् , अन्त्यप्रत्ययवशाददृष्टफलप्राप्तेः ; कर्माण्यपि हि जन्मान्तरोपभोग्यं फलमारभमाणानि तदनुरूपं भावनाविज्ञानं प्रायणकाले आक्षिपन्ति – 'सविज्ञानो भवति सविज्ञानमेवान्ववक्रामतिऽ 'यच्चित्तस्तेनैष प्राणमायातिऽ 'प्राणस्तेजसा युक्तः सहात्मना यथासङ्कल्पितं लोकं नयतिऽ इति चैवमादिश्रुतिभ्यः ; तृणजलूकानिदर्शनाच्च ; प्रत्ययास्त्वेते स्वरूपानुवृत्तिं मुक्त्वा किमन्यत् प्रायणकालभावि भावनाविज्ञानमपेक्षेरन् । तस्मात् ये प्रतिपत्तव्यफलभावनात्मकाः प्रत्ययाः, तेषु आ प्रायणात् आवृत्तिः

BSBh. 4.1.12

With respect to meditations which have the fruit of the nature of secular prosperity, however, there is scope for consideration as to whether one should stop after repeating such meditations for some time, or whether they should be repeated as long as one continues to live.

Objection: What then is the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta)? It is, that meditation having been performed for some time, should be given up, because the scriptural requirement of 'meditation' in which such repetition is implicit, is thereby achieved.

Reply: This being the conclusion (of the opponent of Vedānta) we reply: – Meditation should be repeated right up to the time of death, because the acquisition of the invisible fruit of meditation is dependent upon the final act of the acquisition of knowledge (Antya-pratyaya). Religious acts which begin to produce the fruit to be enjoyed during the next birth, require (Akṣipanti) the knowledge of the nature of i.e. the conception of, such fruit, at the time of death, according to Scriptural passages such as "He becomes endowed with special consciousness of desires; he follows the subtle body (Liṅga-Śarīra) which has such special consciousness of desires" (Br.Up. 4.4.2), "He approaches the Prāṇa with whatsoever he has in his mind. This Prāṇa conjointly with Tejas, takes him along with the Self, to the desired world" (Pra.Up. 3.10). (This is so), also because of the illustration of the caterpillar on the grass (while connected from the previous, the caterpillar connects to the next blade). But so far as these meditations are concerned, what knowledge of desires other than that which accrues at the time of death, apart from the repetition of such meditations, can

such meditations expect? Therefore, there ought to be a repetition of the meditations, which are of the nature or the conception of the knowledge of the desire of the fruit to be obtained at the time of death.

Section 189

References:

यदैवात्मप्रतिपादकवाक्यश्रवणादात्मविषयं विज्ञानमुत्पद्यते, तदैव तदुत्पद्यमानं तद्विषयं मिथ्याज्ञानं निवर्तयदेवोत्पद्यते ;
आत्मविषयमिथ्याज्ञाननिवृत्तौ च तत्प्रभवाः स्मृतयो न भवन्ति स्वाभाविक्योऽनात्मवस्तुभेदविषयाः ; अनर्थत्वावगतेश्च आत्मावगतौ हि सत्याम् अन्यद्वस्तु अनर्थत्वेनावगम्यते,
अनित्यदुःखाशुद्ध्यादिबहुदोषवत्त्वात् आत्मवस्तुनश्च तद्विलक्षणत्वात् ।
तस्मादनात्मविज्ञानस्मृतीनामात्मावगतेरभावप्राप्तिः ;
पारिशेष्यादात्मैकत्वविज्ञानस्मृतिसन्ततेरर्थत एव भावान्न विधेयत्वम् ।
शोकमोहभयायासादिदुःखदोषनिवर्तकत्वाच्च तत्स्मृतेः –
विपरीतज्ञानप्रभवो हि शोकमोहादिदोषः

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

That is to say, as soon as the knowledge of the Self arises in consequence of hearing a dictum delineating It,' it necessarily destroys the false notion about It. It could not arise otherwise. **And when this false notion about the Self is gone, memories due to that, which are natural to man and concern the multitude of things other than the Self, cannot last**. Moreover, everything

else is then known to be an evil. In other words, when the Self is known, things other than It are realised as evils, being full of defects such as transitoriness, painfulness and impurity, while the Self is contrary to them. **Therefore, the memories of notions about the non-Self die out when the Self is known**. As the only alternative left, the train of remembrance of the knowledge that the Self is one, which comes automatically, is not to be prescribed. Besides, the memory of the Self removes the **painful defects such as grief, delusion, fear and effort, for these defects spring from the opposite kind of knowledge.**

एवं तर्हि विद्याप्रत्ययसन्तत्यभावात् विपरीतप्रत्ययतत्कार्ययोश्च दर्शनात् अन्त्य एव आत्मप्रत्ययोऽविद्यानिवर्तकः, न तु पूर्व इति । न, प्रथमेनानैकान्तिकत्वात् – यदि हि प्रथम आत्मविषयः प्रत्ययोऽविद्यां न निवर्तयति, तथा अन्त्योऽपि, तुल्यविषयत्वात् । एवं तर्हि सन्ततोऽविद्यानिवर्तकः न विच्छिन्न इति । न, जीवनादौ सति सन्तत्यनुपपत्तेः – न हि जीवनादिहेतुके प्रत्यये सति विद्याप्रत्ययसन्ततिरुपपद्यते, विरोधात् । अथ जीवनादिप्रत्ययतिरस्करणेनैव आ मरणान्तात् विद्यासन्ततिरिति चेत् । न, प्रत्ययेयत्तासन्तानानवधारणात् शास्त्रार्थानवधारणदोषात् – इयतां प्रत्ययानां सन्ततिरविद्याया निवर्तिकेत्यनवधारणात् शास्त्रार्थो नावध्रियेत । तच्चानिष्टम् । सन्ततिमात्रत्वेऽवधारित एवेति चेत् । न, आद्यन्तयोरविशेषात् – प्रथमा विद्याप्रत्ययसन्ततिः मरणकालान्ता

वेति विशेषाभावात् , आद्यन्तयोः प्रत्यययोः पूर्वोक्तौ दोषौ प्रसज्येयाताम्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Objection: In that case, since there is not a stream of consciousness about knowledge (of Brahman), and since we see that a consciousness of an opposite nature together with its effects persists, let us say that only the last (The one arising at the moment of death.) consciousness of the Self removes ignorance, and not the first one.

Reply: No, for your ground of inference will be falsified on account of the first. If the first consciousness of the Self does not remove ignorance, neither will the last, for they are alike consciousness of the Self.

Objection: Well then, let us say, it is not the isolated consciousness that removes ignorance, but that which is continuous.

Reply: Not so, for there cannot be a continuity, since it would be broken by thoughts of selfpreservation etc. So long as these crop up, there cannot be an unbroken stream of consciousness about knowledge, for the two are contradictory.

Objection: Suppose the latter continues till death to the exclusion of the former.

Reply: Not so, for the uncertainty about the requisite number of thoughts to make up that stream would be

open to the charge of making the meaning of the scriptures indefinite. In other words, there being nothing to determine that so many thoughts would make up a stream that will remove ignorance, it would be impossible to determine the meaning of the scriptures, which is not desirable.

Objection: The meaning is quite definite, for in so far as it is a stream of consciousness, it will remove ignorance.

Reply: No, for there is no difference between the first and the last stream of consciousness. There being nothing to determine whether it is the first stream of consciousness about knowledge that removes ignorance, or the last one ending with the moment of death, they too would be open to those two charges already mentioned with regard to the first and last thoughts.

तस्मात् ये प्रतिपत्तव्यफल-भावनात्मकाः प्रत्ययाः, तेषु आ प्रायणात् आवृत्तिः । तथा च श्रुतिः - 'स यावत्क्रतुरयमस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति' इति । प्रायणकालेऽपि प्रत्ययानुवृत्तिं दर्शयति । स्मृतिरपि - 'यं यं वापि स्मरन्भावं त्यजत्यन्ते कलेवरम्। तं तमेवैति कौन्तेय सदा तद्भावभावितः' (ब्ग्। ८।६) इति,
'प्रयाणकाले मनसाचलेन' (ब्ग्। ८।१०) इति च। 'सोऽन्तवेलायामेतत्त्रयं प्रतिपद्येत' इति च मरणवेलायामपि कर्तव्यशेषं श्रावयति

BSBh. 4.1.12

Therefore, there ought to be a repetition of the meditations, which are of the nature or the conception of

the knowledge of the desire of the fruit to be obtained at the time of death. For even so does the scriptural passage “With whatever special desire he departs from this world”. Indicate the repetition of the act of meditation, even at the time of death. The Smṛti also says – “With whatever desire in mind he departs from the body at the end, to that object of desire, Oh son of Kuntī, obsessed as he is with that desire, he goes” (Gita. 8.6),
“With a steadfast mind, at the time of departure (from the body)” (Gita. 8.10). The Scriptures also declare, that even at the time of death, there is something still remaining to be done, thus – “He should at the time of death, call to his mind the three things” (The three Mantras addressed to the Sun, the Ādhidaivika aspect of Prāṇa thus – “There is no destruction of you, you are constant, you are the subtle element of Prāṇa”).

अन्त्यप्रत्यय-वशाद् अदृष्टफल-प्राप्तेः

BSBh. 4.1.12

Because the acquisition of the invisible fruit of meditation is dependent upon the final act of the acquisition of knowledge (Antya-pratyaya).

Section 190

References:

तच्छेषगत्यनुस्मृति-योगाच्च - विद्याशेष-भूता च मूर्धन्यनाडी-सम्बद्धा गतिः अनुशीलयितव्या विद्या-विशेषेषु विहिता । तामभ्यस्यन् तयैव प्रतिष्ठत इति युक्तम् । तस्मात् हृदयालयेन ब्रह्मणा सूपासितेन अनुगृहीतः तद्भावं समापन्नो विद्वान् । मूर्धन्ययैव शताधिकया शतादतिरिक्तया एकशततम्या नाड्या निष्क्रामति ।
इतराभिरितरे

BSBh. 4.2.17

By reason of the circumstance, that meditation on the path subordinate to those Vidyās is prescribed, it is meant, that inasmuch as in these several different Vidyās, the path subordinate to those Vidyās and connected with the Nāḍī of the head, have been prescribed. It is logical to understand that the Self of him who meditates on that path should tend to go out by that way viz. by that Nāḍī (of the head). Therefore, the wise one, to whom the grace of Brahman, which has the Hṛdaya as its abode, has been vouchsafed, and on whom he has meditated well and has thus attained its (Brahman's) condition goes out by way of the hundred and first Nāḍī which is the one over and above the other hundred Nāḍīs and the others (i.e. the ignorant) go out by way of the other hundred Nāḍīs.

Section 191

References:

परीक्ष्य लोकान्कर्मचितान्ब्राह्मणो निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन ।

तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम्

Mund.Up. 1.2.12 (sruti)

A Brahmana should resort to renunciation after examining the worlds acquired through karma, with the help of this maxim: 'There is nothing (here) that is not the result of karma; so what is the need of (performing) karma?' For knowing that Reality he should go, with sacrificial faggots in hand, only to a teacher versed in the Vedas and absorbed in Brahman.

इह संसारे नास्ति कश्चिदपि अकृतः पदार्थः । सर्व एव हि लोकाः कर्मचिताः कर्मकृतत्वाच्चानित्याः । न नित्यं किञ्चिदस्तीत्यभिप्रायः

Mund.Up. 1.2.12 Bh.

In this universe there is nothing that is akrta, a nonproduct; for all the worlds are effects of karma; and being products of action, they are impermanent. The idea is that there is nothing that is eternal.

अतःशब्दो हेत्वर्थः। यस्माद् वेद एव अग्निहोत्रादीनां श्रेयःसाधनानाम् अनित्यफलतां दर्शयति – 'तद्यथेह कर्मचितो लोकः क्षीयत एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यचितो लोकः क्षीयते' (छन्।उप्। ८।१।६) इत्यादिः । तथा ब्रह्मज्ञानादपि परं पुरुषार्थं दर्शयति – 'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तैत्।उप्। २।१)

BSBh. 1.1.1

The word 'Therefore' (Ataḥ, in the Sūtra) is indicative of the reason, in as much as the Scriptures themselves disclose the transitory nature of the fruit of such means of acquiring secular prosperity as the Agni-hotra etc., thus – "As here on earth whatever has been acquired by religious actions perishes, even so, in the next world also whatever is acquired by merit, perishes" (Chan.Up. 8.1.6) etc. Similarly, the scriptures also show that by realizing Brahman the highest aim of man is attained, thus – "One who realizes Brahman attains liberation." (Tai.Up. 2.1).

तदेष श्लोको भवति । तदेव सक्तः सह कर्मणैति लिङ्गं मनो यत्र निषक्तमस्य । प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणस्तस्य यत्किञ्चेह करोत्ययम् । तस्माल्लोकात्पुनरैत्यस्मै लोकाय कर्मण इति नु कामयमानोऽथाकामयमानो योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति

Br.Up. 4.4.6 (sruti)

Regarding this there is the following verse: 'Being attached, he, together with the work, attains that result to which his subtle body or mind is attached. Exhausting the results of whatever work he did in this life, he returns

from that world to this for (fresh) work.' Thus does the man who desires (transmigrate). But the man who does not desire (never transmigrates). Of him who is without desires, who is free from desires, the objects of whose desire have been attained, and to whom all objects of desire are but the Self–the organs do not depart. Being but Brahman, he is merged in Brahman.

किञ्च प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणः – प्राप्य भुक्त्वा अन्तम् अवसानं यावत् , कर्मणः फलपरिसमाप्तिं कृत्वेत्यर्थः ; कस्य कर्मणोऽन्तं प्राप्येत्युच्यते – तस्य, यत्किञ्च कर्म इह अस्मिन् लोके करोति निर्वर्तयति अयम् , तस्य कर्मणः फलं भुक्त्वा अन्तं प्राप्य, तस्मात् लोकात् पुनः ऐति आगच्छति, अस्मै लोकाय कर्मणे – अयं हि लोकः कर्मप्रधानः, तेनाह 'कर्मणेऽ इति – पुनः कर्मकरणाय ; पुनः कर्म कृत्वा फलासङ्गवशात् पुनरमुं लोकं याति – इत्येवम्

Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.

Moreover, having attained i.e., enjoyed the results of actions entirely, that is to say, exhausted the fruits of action - of what action? This is being specified: Whatever action he had performed in this world, he reaches again this world from the other to perform action. In this world importance is attached to action. Hence it has been said, 'to perform action', i.e., to perform action again. After performing actions again, owing to the attachment to its fruits, he goes again to the other world and so on.

कर्मकार्यस्यानित्यत्वं प्रसिद्धं लोके। कर्मभ्यश्चेच्छ्रेयो नित्यं स्यात्तच्चानिष्टम्। "तद्यथेह कर्मचितो लोकः क्षीयते" (छा।उ।८।१।६) इति न्यायानुगृहीतश्रुतिविरोधात्

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

The ephemeral nature of the effect of karma is well-known in the world. **If liberation which is eternal follows from karmas, that is undesirable, for it contradicts the logical effect of the sruti passage, "Just as here the world acquired through karmas perishes, so also, the other world acquired through righteous acts perishes" (Chand.Up. 8.1.6)**.

उत्पत्तिविकारसंस्काराप्तयो हि फलं कर्मणो दृश्यन्ते ।
उत्पत्त्यादिफलविपरीतश्च मोक्षः

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

for **karma is seen to result in creation, improvement (purification), transformation, or acquisition. And liberation is opposed to such results as creation etc**.

Section 192

References:

पुत्रस्वर्गब्रह्मवर्चसादिलक्षणस्य कर्मफलस्यासङ्ख्येयत्वात् तत्प्रति च पुरुषाणां कामबाहुल्यात्तदर्थः श्रुतेरधिको यत्नः कर्मसूपपद्यते, आशिषां बाहुल्यदर्शनात् इदं मे स्यादिदं मे स्यादिति

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

since there is an abundance of the results of karma, comprising progeny, heaven, glory of holiness, etc., and since people have an abundance of desire for those results, the great solicitude for karma evinced by the Sruti for achieving those results is reasonable: for it is a matter of experience that peoples' desires expressed in such forms as 'Let this be mine' 'May that one be mine' are multifarious.

किञ्चान्यत् कल्प्ये च फले नित्यानां कर्मणां श्रुतानाम् , यत् कर्मभिर्विरुध्यते – द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां कार्यमेव न भवति – किं तत् कल्प्यताम् , यस्मिन् कर्मणः सामर्थ्यमेव न दृष्टम् ? किं वा यस्मिन् दृष्टं सामर्थ्यम् , यच्च कर्मणां फलमविरुद्धम् , तत्कल्प्यतामिति । पुरुषप्रवृत्तिजननाय अवश्यं चेत् कर्मफलं कल्पयितव्यम् – कर्माविरुद्धविषय एव श्रुतार्थापत्तेः क्षीणत्वात् नित्यो मोक्षः फलं कल्पयितुं न शक्यः, तद्व्यवधानाज्ञाननिवृत्तिर्वा

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

Moreover, if some result must be presumed for the regular rites mentioned in the Śrutis, should it be that which clashes with work, which cannot possibly be the effect of substance, attribute, or action, and over which work is never known to have any power, or should it rather be that result over which work is known to have power, and which harmonises with work? If those rites must be presumed to have some result to induce people to perform them, then, since presumption from scriptural

statements is fulfilled by the assumption of a result that harmonises with them, neither liberation, which is eternal, nor the cessation of the ignorance that obstructs it, can be supposed to be this result; for the former kind of result would be in keeping with the nature of work, and would be a subject where it is known to function.

अविरुद्धत्वात् दृष्टसामर्थ्यविषयत्वाच्चेति पारिशेष्यन्यायात् मोक्ष एव कल्पयितव्य इति चेत् सर्वेषां हि कर्मणां सर्वं फलम् ; न च अन्यत् इतरकर्मफलव्यतिरेकेण फलं कल्पनायोग्यमस्ति ; परिशिष्टश्च मोक्षः ; स च इष्टः वेदविदां फलम् ; तस्मात् स एव कल्पयितव्यः इति चेत् । न, कर्मफलव्यक्तीनाम् आनन्त्यात् पारिशेष्यन्यायानुपपत्तेः ; न हि पुरुषेच्छाविषयाणां कर्मफलानाम् एतावत्त्वं नाम केनचित् असर्वज्ञेनावधृतम् , तत्साधनानां वा, पुरुषेच्छानां वा अनियतदेशकालनिमित्तत्वात् पुरुषेच्छाविषयसाधनानां च पुरुषेष्टफलप्रयुक्तत्वात् ; प्रतिप्राणि च इच्छावैचित्र्यात् फलानां तत्साधनानां च आनन्त्यसिद्धिः ; तदानन्त्याच्च अशक्यम् एतावत्त्वं पुरुषैर्ज्ञातुम् ; अज्ञाते च साधनफलैतावत्त्वे कथं मोक्षस्य परिशेषसिद्धिरिति

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

Objection: We maintain that on the principle of the residuum liberation must be supposed to be this result. To explain: All rites produce those results (heaven, animals, children, etc.). Barring the other kind of result, however, we do not find anything else that can be supposed to be the result of the regular rites; only

liberation is left, and it is a result coveted by the knowers of the Vedas. Therefore, that must be supposed to be the result in question.

Reply: No, for since the individual results of those rites may be infinite in number, you cannot apply the principle of the residuum. No one who is not omniscient can assert that the objects desired by men as the results of their work, or the means of attaining them, or the desires themselves are so many in number; for they have no fixed place, time, or cause, and are regulated by the kind of result those men seek. Again, as each individual has various desires, the results, as also their means, are necessarily infinite; and because they are infinite, it is impossible for any one to know exactly how many they are. So, when the exact number of the results and their means is unknown, how can liberation be proved to be the only remaining item?

कर्मफलजातिपारिशेष्यमिति चेत् – सत्यपि इच्छाविषयाणां तत्साधनानां च आनन्त्ये, कर्मफलजातित्वं नाम सर्वेषां तुल्यम् ; मोक्षस्तु अकर्मफलत्वात् परिशिष्टः स्यात् ; तस्मात् परिशेषात् स एव युक्तः कल्पयितुमिति चेत् ।
न ; तस्यापि नित्यकर्मफलत्वाभ्युपगमे कर्मफलसमानजातीयत्वोपपत्तेः परिशेषानुपपत्तिः । तस्मात् अन्यथाप्युपपत्तेः क्षीणा श्रुतार्थापत्तिः ;

उत्पत्त्याप्तिविकारसंस्काराणामन्यतममपि नित्यानां कर्मणां फलमुपपद्यत इति क्षीणा श्रुतार्थापत्तिः

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

Objection: But it is the only remaining item outside the results of work as a class. To be explicit: Although the objects desired and their means are infinite, they all alike fall within the category of results of work; but liberation, not being the result of work, would be left out; hence, being the only remaining item, it should be taken to be the result in question.

Reply: No, for according to you it is the result of the regular rites, and therefore belongs to the same category as the other results of work; hence it cannot be counted as the residuum. Therefore we must conclude that presumption from scriptural statements is fulfilled, since there is another way of solving the problem, viz. by supposing that any one of the functions of production, attainment, modification and purification is the result of the regular rites.

नित्यानां च कर्मणां पुण्यफलत्वश्रुतेः

BGh. 18.66

Besides, since the Śruti [see Ch.Up. 2.23.1] mentions that nitya-karmas have heaven as their result.

एतेषां जातिविहितानां कर्मणां सम्यगनुष्ठितानां स्वर्गप्राप्तिः फलं स्वभावतः, ‘वर्णा आश्रमाश्च स्वकर्मनिष्ठाः प्रेत्य कर्मफलमनुभूय ततः शेषेण विशिष्टदेशजातिकुलधर्मायुःश्रुतवृत्तवित्तसुखमेधसो जन्म प्रतिपद्यन्ते’ (गौ। ध। २-२-२९), (मै। गौ। ध। ११-३१) इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यः, पुराणे च वर्णिनाम् आश्रमिणां च लोकफलभेदविशेषस्मरणात्

BGh. 18.44

When rightly pursued, the natural result of these duties enjoined for the castes [From Brāhmaṇa to Śūdra.] is the attainment of heaven – which fact is evident from such Smṛti texts as, ‘People belonging to the castes and stages of life, who are true to their own duties, experience after death the fruit of their actions. And after that, as a result of the remnants of their merits they are born in some excellent region, caste and family, with greater piety, longevity, learning, conduct, wealth, happiness and intelligence’ (Āp. Dh. Sū. 2.2.2.3), etc. And in the Purāṇas also it is particularly mentioned that people belonging to the (different) castes and stages of life come to have specific results in the form of different worlds.

Section 193

References:

न च असति सम्यग्दर्शने सर्वात्मना काम्य-प्रतिषिद्ध-वर्जनं जन्मप्रायणान्तराले केनचित्प्रतिज्ञातुं शक्यम्, सुनिपुणानामपि सूक्ष्मापराध-दर्शनात्

BSBh. 4.3.14

It is not possible for any body, who has not attained true i.e., perfect knowledge, to be able to assert confidently, that during his whole life between his birth and death, he would avoid performing acts performed with a desire (Kāmya-Karma) and avoid the performance of acts prohibited (Pratiṣiddha), because it is observed that even the cleverest (persons) are guilty of performing some such pardonable acts.

कर्मानेकत्वात् । अनेकानि हि आरब्धफलानि अनारब्धफलानि च अनेकजन्मान्तरकृतानि विरुद्धफलानि कर्माणि सम्भवन्ति । अतः तेष्वनारब्धफलानामेकस्मिञ्जन्मन्युपभोगेन क्षयासम्भवात् शेषकर्मनिमित्तशरीरारम्भोपपत्तिः । कर्मशेषसद्भावसिद्धिश्च 'तद्य इह रमणीयचरणाः' (छा। उ। ५ । १० । ७) 'ततः शेषेण' (आ। ध। २ । २ । २ । ३)(गो। स्मृ। ११) इत्यादि श्रुतिस्मृतिशतेभ्यः

Tai.Up.Upod. Bh.

Because karma is multifarious, and as such, there is the possibility that there are actions-done in many previous

births and bearing fruits (in this life) or remaining in abeyance-which have opposite results. **Accordingly, since those of the actions that have not begun to bear fruits (in this life) cannot possibly become exhausted through enjoyment in (this) one single birth, it is reasonable that a fresh body shall be created as a result of the residual fruits of action**; and the existence of residual fruits of work is also proved by hundreds of Vedic and Smrti texts such as: 'Among them, those who were performers of meritorious deeds here, (they will attain good births)' (Ch.Up. 5.10.7); 'Owing to the residual (results, the soul gets its future birth)' (Ap. II. 2.2.3; Gau. 11).

अशरीरत्वमेव धर्मकार्यमिति चेत् । न; तस्य स्वाभाविकत्वात् – 'अशरीरं शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितम्। महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति' (कथ्।उप्। १।२।२२) । 'अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रः' (मुन्।उप्। २।१।२) । 'असङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।३।१५) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

BSBh. 1.1.4

Objection: If it be said (by the opponent) that the disembodied condition is itself the result of duty.
Reply: It is not so, because the condition of being unembodied is natural to the Ātmā as illustrated by the following scriptural passages – "The wise one, knowing the Self being bodiless amongst the embodied, unchanging amongst the changeable, great, omni-present,

does not grieve" (Kath.Up. 1.2.22), "He is without vital breath (Prāṇa), without mind and is pure" (Mun.Up. 2.1.2), That Puruṣa is without any attachment" (Br.Up. 4.3.15).

अज्ञानमेव निवर्तयतीति चेत् । न, विलक्षणत्वात् – अनभिव्यक्तिः अज्ञानम् अभिव्यक्तिलक्षणेन ज्ञानेन विरुध्यते ; कर्म तु नाज्ञानेन विरुध्यते ; तेन ज्ञानविलक्षणं कर्म । यदि ज्ञानाभावः, यदि संशयज्ञानम् , यदि विपरीतज्ञानं वा उच्यते अज्ञानमिति, सर्वं हि तत् ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्यते ; न तु कर्मणा अन्यतमेनापि विरोधाभावात्

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

Objection: Suppose we say work removes that ignorance? Reply: No, for it is something quite different. Ignorance, which is non-manifestation, is the opposite of knowledge, which is manifestation; but work is not the opposite of ignorance and is therefore entirely different from knowledge. **Ignorance, whether it means the want of knowledge, or doubt, or a false notion, is always removable by knowledge, but not by work in any of its forms, for there is no contradiction between ignorance and work.**

न, 'तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' (स्वे।उप्। ३।८) इति विद्याया अन्यः पन्थाः मोक्षाय न विद्यते इति श्रुतेः, चर्मवदाकाशवेष्टनासम्भववत् अविदुषः मोक्षासम्भवश्रुतेः, 'ज्ञानात्कैवल्यमाप्नोति' (?) इति च पुराणस्मृतेः

BGh. 18.66

Vedāntin: No, since there is the Upaniṣad text, 'Knowing Him alone, one goes beyond death; there is no other way to go by' (Svet.Up. 3.8), which states that for liberation there is no other path but enlightenment (self-knowledge); also because there is the Upaniṣad statement that liberation for an unenlightened person is as impossible as the rolling up of the sky like leather and since it is mentioned **in the Purāṇas and the Smṛtis that liberation follows only from Knowledge.**

न ह्येतत् शास्त्रेण केनचित्प्रतिपादितम् - मोक्षार्थी इत्थं समाचरेदिति । स्वमनीषया तु एतत्तर्कितम् - यस्मात्कर्मनिमित्तः संसारः । तस्मान्निमित्ताभावान्न भविष्यतीति । न च एतत् तर्कयितुं शक्यते, निमित्ताभावस्य दुर्ज्ञानत्वात्

BSBh. 4.3.14

No Śāstra has ever propounded, that a person desirous of liberation should behave in this particular way. It has been inferred by such people as a result of their own wishful thinking, that inasmuch as transmigratory existence results from actions, it would not so result, in the absence of such a cause. Besides, as it is extremely difficult to understand that there is in fact an absence of any such cause, it is not possible even to infer so.

Section 194

References:

विरोधादेव च विद्या मोक्षं प्रति न कर्माण्यपेक्षते । स्वात्मलाभे तु पूर्वोपचितदुरितप्रतिबन्धापनयनद्वारेण विद्याहेतुत्वं प्रतिपद्यन्ते कर्माणि नित्यानीति । अत एवास्मिन्प्रकरणे उपन्यस्तानि कर्माणीत्यवोचाम । एवं च अविरोधः कर्मविधिश्रुतीनाम् । अतः केवलाया एव विद्यायाः परं श्रेय इति सिद्धम्

Tai.Up. 1.11.2-4 Bh.

And just because of this opposition, knowledge does not depend on karma so far as emancipation is concerned. But **in the matter of attainment of one's Self, the obligatory karma becomes the cause for the dawn of knowledge by way of removing the hindrance of accumulated sins**. We have pointed out that this is the reason why karmas have been introduced in the present context. Thus, the Vedic texts enjoining karmas are not at variance (with the Upanisads). **Hence it is established that the highest goal is achievable through knowledge alone.**

अभ्युदयार्थोऽपि यः प्रवृत्ति-लक्षणो धर्मो वर्णाश्रमांश् चोद्दिश्य विहितः स देवादि-स्थान-प्राप्ति-हेतुर् अपि सन्न् ईश्वरार्पण-बुद्ध्यानुष्ठीयमानः सत्त्व-शुद्धये भवति फलाभिसन्धि-वर्जितः । शुद्ध-सत्त्वस्य च ज्ञान-

निष्ठा-योग्यता-प्राप्ति-द्वारेण ज्ञानोत्पत्ति-हेतुत्वेन च निःश्रेयस-हेतुत्वम् अपि प्रतिपद्यते

BGh. Upod.

The ethical principles (Pravṛtti-lakṣaṇa dharma) which have been laid down for all the Varṇas (classes) and Āśramas (stages of life), are means to the attainment of material prosperity, as well as the Deva-sthāna (the position of the Devas) and the like, and if observed without desire for the fruits thereof, in a spirit of dedication to the Lord, they will tend to purity the mind. And the **one who is pure (śuddha) in mind becomes fit to devote oneself to knowledge (jñāna-niṣṭhā) and through the attainment of knowledge, mokṣa (self-knowledge) too becomes possible.**

ननु विरुद्धमिदं वचनम् - अपेक्षते च आश्रमकर्माणि विद्या, नापेक्षते चेति । नेति ब्रूमः; उत्पन्ना हि विद्या । फलसिद्धिं प्रति न किञ्चिदन्यदपेक्षते । उत्पत्तिं प्रति तु अपेक्षते । कुतः? यज्ञादिश्रुतेः । तथा हि श्रुतिः - 'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन' (ब्र।उप्। ४।४।२२) इति । यज्ञादीनां विद्यासाधनभावं दर्शयति । विविदिषा-संयोगाच्चैषाम् उत्पत्तिसाधनभावोऽवसीयते

BSBh. 3.4.26

Opponent: But the statement that religious actions pertaining to the orders of life, are, at one and the same time, both needed and not so needed, is contradictory.

Reply: No, knowledge (of the Self) when once it is generated, needs nothing whatsoever, for the attainment of its fruit (i.e. liberation), But so far as its own generation is concerned, it does so need (the performance of religious actions). Whence is it so? Because of the scriptural statement about sacrifices etc. For so goes the scriptural statement – "The Brāhmaṇas desire to realize the Self by means of the recitation of the scriptures (Vedānuvacana), sacrifices, charities, and fasting or living only on what they casually get as food (Anāśakena)" (Br.Up. 4.4.22), and it indicates, that **sacrifices etc. are the means of the attainment of the knowledge (of the Self).** Now the determination that these (sacrifices etc.) are such means, results from their connection with the desire to know.

स्मृतिरपि - 'कषायपक्तिः कर्माणि ज्ञानं तु परमा गतिः। कषाये कर्मभिः पक्वे ततो ज्ञानं प्रवर्तते' इत्येवमाद्या

BSBh. 3.4.26

So says the Smṛti also, thus – "Religious actions cook up or digest uncleanliness, and knowledge (of the Self) is the Highest goal". Knowledge supervenes from actions, after such actions have purified uncleanliness etc.

विद्या-सहायस्याग्निहोत्रादेः विद्यानिमित्तेन सामर्थ्यातिशयेन योगात् आत्मज्ञानं प्रति कश्चित्कारणत्वातिशयो भविष्यति, न तथा विद्याविहीनस्य - इति युक्तं कल्पयितुम्

BSBh. 4.1.18

Rather, it is logical to imagine that as an Agnihotra which is connected with Vidyā has very great power because of such Vidyā, it only happens to be a superior means as regards the knowledge of the Self, while it is not so in the case of a mere Agnihotra which is not so connected with Vidyā.

नित्यानां च अकरणमभावः ततः प्रत्यवायानुपपत्तिरिति । अतः पूर्वोपचितदुरितेभ्यः प्राप्यमाणायाः प्रत्यवायक्रियाया नित्याकरणं लक्षणमिति शतृप्रत्ययस्य नानुपपत्तिः - 'अकुर्वन्विहितं कर्म' (मनु। ११ । ४४) इति

Tai.Up.Upod Bh.

Besides, the non-performance of obligatory duties is a negation, from which an evil consequence cannot reasonably follow; hence the non-observance of the obligatory duties is a pointer to the fruition of the evil consequences flowing from the sins accumulated in the past. Accordingly, the use of the suffix satr (-ing) is not unreasonable in the text: 'Not performing the obligatory duty (and performing the prohibited ones and getting attached to sense-objects, a man courts his donwfall)' (M. XI.44).

Section 195

References:

एवं तर्हि विद्यासंव्यपेक्षेभ्यः कर्मभ्यः स्यान्मोक्षः ; विद्यासहितानां च कर्मणां भवेत्कार्यान्तरारम्भसामर्थ्यम् ; यथा स्वतो मरणज्वरादिकार्यारम्भसमर्थानामपि विषदध्यादीनां मन्त्रसशर्करादिसंयुक्तानां कार्यान्तरारम्भसामर्थ्यम् , एवं विद्याहितैः कर्मभिः मोक्ष आरभ्यत इति चेत् । न ; आरभ्यस्यानित्यत्वादित्युक्तो दोषः । वचनादारभ्योऽपि नित्य एवेति चेत् । न ; ज्ञापकत्वाद्वचनस्य । वचनं नाम यथाभूतस्यार्थस्य ज्ञापकम् , नाविद्यमानस्य कर्तृ । न हि वचनशतेनापि नित्यमारभ्यते, आरब्धं वा अविनाशि भवेत् । एतेन विद्याकर्मणोः संहतयोर्मोक्षारम्भकत्वं प्रत्युक्तम्

Tai.Up.1.11.2-4 Bh.

Opponent: In that case, emancipation can result from karma aided by knowledge. Karma, as assoicated with knowledge, should have the power of producing a different result. Just as position, curd, etc., which by themselves are calculated to effect death, fever, etc., can produce different results when mixed with sacred formulae, sugar, etc., similarly, emancipation is generated by karma when associated with knoweldge.
Answer: No, for the defect was pointed out (by us) by stating that whatever is produced is impermanent.
Objection: On the authority of scriptural text emancipation is eternal, though it is produced.

Answer: No, for a scriptural text is only informative. A scriptural passage supplies information of a thing existing as such; it cannot create a thing that does not exist. **Anything that is eternal cannot have a beginning, nor can anything be indestructible if it has a beginning despite a hundred texts (to the contrary).**
The third opponent answers: Hereby is refuted the view that knowledge and karma is their combination can produce emancipation.

बाढम् ; भवतु केवलस्यैव कर्मण एवं स्वभावता ; विद्यासंयुक्तस्य तु निरभिसन्धेः भवति अन्यथा स्वभावः ; दृष्टं हि अन्यशक्तित्वेन निर्ज्ञातानामपि पदार्थानां विषदध्यादीनां विद्यामन्त्रशर्करादिसंयुक्तानाम् अन्यविषये सामर्थ्यम् ; तथा कर्मणोऽप्यस्त्विति चेत् ।
न । प्रमाणाभावात् । तत्र हि कर्मण उक्तविषयव्यतिरेकेण विषयान्तरे सामर्थ्यास्तित्वे प्रमाणं न प्रत्यक्षं नानुमानं नोपमानं नार्थापत्तिः न शब्दोऽस्ति
Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.
Objection: True. We admit that work alone is of such a nature; but disinterested work coupled with meditation is of a different nature. It is common experience that things known to have a particular property, such as poison or curd, display, in combination with special knowledge, charms or sugar, for instance, quite a different property. Why not admit the same about work?

Reply: No, for there is no evidence in support. In other words, there is not one evidence–neither perception, nor inference, nor comparison, nor presumption, nor scriptural statement to prove that work has any other function but those enumerated above.

यन्नित्यं कर्म वैदिकमग्निहोत्रादि तत् तत्कार्यायैव भवति । ज्ञानस्य यत्कार्यं तदेव अस्यापि कार्यमित्यर्थः

BSBh. 4.1.16

Whatever is routine (Nitya) Vedic religious action, such as Agni-hotra etc. for instance., makes for precisely the same result. The meaning is that the result of such action is the same as the result of knowledge.

सत्यमेतत् - विद्यासंयुक्तं कर्म अग्निहोत्रादिकं विद्याविहीनात्कर्मणोऽग्निहोत्राद्विशिष्टम् । विद्वान् इव ब्राह्मणो विद्याविहीनाद् ब्राह्मणात्

BSBh. 4.1.18

It is true that an act such as Agnihotra etc. when it is connected with Vidyā is superior to a mere act of Agnihotra which is not so connected (with Vidyā), just as a Brāhmaṇa who is equipped with Vidyā, is superior to one who is not so equipped.

विरोधाच्च विद्याकर्मणोः समुच्चयानुपपत्तिः ।
प्रलीनकर्त्रादिकारकविशेषतत्त्वविषया हि विद्या तद्विपरीतकारकसाध्येन कर्मणा विरुध्यते । न ह्येकं वस्तु परमार्थतः कर्त्रादिविशेषवत् तच्छून्यं

चेति उभयथा द्रष्टुं शक्यते । अवश्यं ह्यन्तरन्मिथ्या स्यात् । अन्यतरस्य च मिथ्यात्वप्रसङ्गे युक्तं यत्स्वाभाविकाज्ञानविषयस्य द्वैतस्य मिथ्यात्वम्

Tai.Up.1.11.2-4 Bh.

Besides, the combination of knowledge and karma is not possible, because of their mutual contradiction. For knowledge which relates to an entity in which all distinction of accessories, such as the agent, get merged is opposing to karma that has to be accomplished with accessories which are opposed to it (knowledge). **Indeed, the same thing cannot be visualized as being in reality both possessed of such distinctions as agentship etc., and as devoid of them**. Either of the two must of necessity be false. And when one or the other has to be false, it is reasonable that falsehood should pertain to duality which is the object of natural ignorance.

अपि च कर्माधिकार-हेतोः क्रियाकारकफल-लक्षणस्य समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य अविद्याकृतस्य विद्यासामर्थ्यात् स्वरूपोपमर्दमामनन्ति - 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्तत्केन कं जिघ्रेत्' (ब्र।उप्। २।४।१४) इत्यादिना

BSBh. 3.4.16

Moreover, the scriptures mention that there is destruction (Upamarda), of the inherent nature (Svarūpa) of this entire apparent worldly manifestation (Prapañca) which is brought about by ignorance, which is characterized by actions (such as sacrifices), materials (of such sacrifices),

and fruits of sacrifices. And which are the means by which competency for religious actions is conferred through (the acquisition of) the power of Vidyā, thus – "But when to him (the knower of Brahman) everything has become but the Self only, then what should one see, and by what, and what should one smell, and by what?" (Br.Up. 2.4.14) etc.

न च असत्यमित्युपमर्दिते भेदप्रत्यये सत्यमिदमनेन कर्तव्यं मयेति प्रमाणप्रमेयबुद्धिरुपपद्यते आकाश इव तलमलबुद्धिर्विवेकिनः । उपमर्दितेऽपि भेदप्रत्यये कर्मभ्यो न निवर्तते चेत् , प्रागिव भेदप्रत्ययानुपमर्दनादेकत्वप्रत्ययविधायकं वाक्यमप्रमाणीकृतं स्यात् । अभक्ष्यभक्षणादिप्रतिषेधवाक्यानां प्रामाण्यवत् युक्तमेकत्ववाक्यस्यापि प्रामाण्यम् , सर्वोपनिषदां तत्परत्वात्

Ch.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

Moreover, when the idea of duality is demolished by the realisation that it. (Duality) is false, then, there cannot reasonably arise any awareness of the means of knowledge or the things to be known, in the form, 'This is true. This has to be performed by me through this', just as a person who has discriminative knowledge does not perceive any surface of or dirt in space.

If it is argued that even after the demolition of the idea of differences, one does not desist from rites and duties just as he did not desist before the demolition of the idea of differences, then, the Vedic text enjoining the

conviction of Unity will be rendered invalid. Like the validity of the texts prohibiting eating of things that are not to be eaten, it is reasonable that the text about Unity should have validity since all the Upanisads establish this fact.

विद्याकर्मणी मोक्षप्रतिबन्धहेतुनिवर्तके इति चेत् । न ; कर्मणः फलान्तरदर्शनात् । उत्पत्तिविकारसंस्काराप्तयो हि फलं कर्मणो दृश्यन्ते । उत्पत्त्यादिफलविपरीतश्च मोक्षः

Tai.Up.1.11.2-4 Bh.

Objection: Knowledge and karma remove the causes that hinder emancipation.

Answer: No, because karma is known to have a different effect; for karma is seen to result in creation, improvement (purification), transformation, or acquisition. And liberation is opposed to such results as creation etc.

अन्यत् पृथगेव विद्यया क्रियते फलमिति आहुः वदन्ति, अन्यदाहुरविद्यया कर्मणा क्रियते फलमिति । तथोक्तम् – 'कर्मणा पितृलोकः, विद्यया देवलोकः' (बृ। उ। १ । ५ । १६) इति । इति एवं शुश्रुम श्रुतवन्तो वयं धीराणां धीमतां वचनम्

Isa.Up. 10 Bh.

A really different (thing); is produced as a result by vidyā (worship of meditation) - this, they say, because of the Veda texts: 'The world of gods is (won) through meditation' (Br.Up. 1.5.16). 'They ascend there through meditation'. They say by avidyā, karma, (rites), a different

(result) is produced, because of the Veda text: ‘The world of the Manes (is won) through karma’ (Br.Up. 1.5.16). Thus, we have heard, the teaching, of the wise men.

विद्यां च अविद्यां च देवताज्ञानं कर्म चेत्यर्थः । यस्तत् एतदुभयं सह एकेन पुरुषेण अनुष्ठेयं वेद तस्यैवं समुच्चयकारिण एकैकपुरुषार्थसम्बन्धः क्रमेण स्यादित्युच्यते – अविद्यया कर्मणा अग्निहोत्रादिना मृत्युम् , स्वाभाविकं कर्म ज्ञानं च मृत्युशब्दवाच्यम् , तदुभयं तीर्त्वा अतिक्रम्य विद्यया देवताज्ञानेन अमृतं देवतात्मभावम् अश्नुते प्राप्नोति । तद्ध्यमृतमुच्यते, यद्देवतात्मगमनम्

Isa.Up. 11 Bh.

Since this is so, therefore vidya and avidya, i.e. meditation on the deities and the rites, he who knows these together, knows them as things to be performed by the same person; for that man alone, who thus combines (the two), there occurs the successive acquisition of the two goals in the same individual. This is being said: Through avidyā (ignorance), through rites such as Agnihotra, death - rites and meditation induced by one's nature, crossing overover both these which are called death through vidya. The meditation on the deities; (one) attains, immortality, identification with the deities that very fact of becoming one with gods being called immortality.

Section 196

References:

तथा हि - 'तरति शोकमात्मवित्' (छन्।उप्। ७।१।३), 'स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मुन्।उप्। ३।२।९), 'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' (तैत्।उप्। २।१।१), 'आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ सम्पत्स्ये' (छन्।उप्। ६।१४।२), 'य आत्मापहतपाप्मा' (छन्।उप्। ८।७।१) इत्युपक्रम्य, स सर्वांश्च लोकानाप्नोति सर्वां श्च कामान्यस्तमात्मानमनुविद्य विजानाति' (छनु।८।७।१) इति । 'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।६) इत्युपक्रम्य, 'एतावदरे खल्वमृतत्वम्' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।१५) इति । एवंजातीयका श्रुतिः केवलाया विद्यायाः पुरुषार्थ-हेतुत्वं श्रावयति

BSBh. 3.4.1

Of such kind as "One who knows the Self transcends grief" (Chan.Up. 7.1.3), "He who knows that transcendent Brahman, himself becomes Brahman" (Mun.Up. 3.2.9), "One who knows the Brahma-Self attains transcendent Brahman" (Tait.Up. 2.1.1), "It is the one (who is blessed) with a teacher that knows (Brahman); He needs but wait only till he is relieved (of the body) and (when he is so relieved) he directly attains (Brahman)" (Chan.Up. 6.14.2). Again beginning thus – "This Self which is free from sin". The Scriptures further declare – "He who has searched for and understood that Self obtains all the worlds and ail desires" (Chan.Up. 8.7.1). Similarly, scriptural statements beginning with "It is the Self, Oh, Maitreyī, that should be

seen" (Br.Up. 4.5.6). The Scriptures by the passage "Such indeed, Oh Maitreyī, is the measure of immortality" (Br.Up. 4.5.15), declare, how the **knowledge (of the Self) alone is the means of attaining the chief aim of man.**

श्रुतिर्हि वैदिकादात्मैकत्वविज्ञानादन्यन्निःश्रेयससाधनं वारयति - 'तमेव विदित्वाति मृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' (स्वे।उप्। ३।८) इति

BSBh. 2.1.3

The Scriptures reject the possibility of any other means of attaining liberation, except the knowledge of the unity (identity) of the Self referred to in the Vedas, thus – "It is by knowing that (Ātmā i.e., Brahman) alone, that a person transcends death, and there is no other path to liberation" (Sve.Up. 3.8).

ज्ञानस्यैव हि प्रापकं सत् कर्म। प्रणाड्या मोक्षकारणमित्युपचर्यते

BSBh. 4.1.16

Action being something which promotes knowledge, it is metaphorically said to be the means of liberation, through the medium of knowledge.

Section 197

References:

आश्रममात्रनिष्ठस्याप्यमुमुक्षोः कर्तव्यान्येव नित्यानि कर्माणि । 'यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं जुहोति' इत्यादिना विहितत्वात् । न हि वचनस्यातिभारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति

BSBh. 3.4.32

These permanent religious duties have necessarily to be performed even by one who is merely attached to an order of life and does not desire to attain liberation, because they are enjoined by such scriptural passages as – "He must perform the Agnihotra as long as he continues to live". Indeed, it is not (even if it is understood to be so) that the scriptural passage would thereby have to bear the burden of a meaning which it cannot well bear.

विज्ञानादेवाप्नोति स्वाराज्यमित्युक्तत्वात् श्रौतस्मार्तानां कर्मणामानर्थक्यं प्राप्तमित्येतन्मा प्रापदिति कर्मणां पुरुषार्थं प्रति साधनत्वप्रदर्शनार्थ इहोपन्यासः

Tai.Up. 1.9.1 Bh.

From the statement that knowledge alone leads to the attainment of sovereignty, it may follow that the duties enjoined by Vedas and Smrtis are useless. In order to avoid such a contingency, the duties are being presented here, so that they may be shown as contributory to the attainment of human goals.

सगुणासु तु विद्यासु कर्तृत्वानतिवृत्तेः । सम्भवति आगाम्यपि अग्निहोत्रादि । तस्यापि निरभिसन्धिनः कार्यान्तराभावाद् । विद्या-सङ्गत्युपपत्तिः

BSBh. 4.1.16

In the case of **meditations connected with qualified Brahman, inasmuch as in that case, a man does not cease to be an agent, the performance of Agnihotra etc. even afterwards (i.e., after attaining knowledge of qualified Brahman) is of course possible**. And when such action is performed in a disinterested manner (without any motive), then in the absence of its having any relation to any other result it is reasonably sustainable, that it has appropriateness for such a relation to meditation (Vidyā).

वेदमनूच्येत्येवमादिकर्तव्यतोपदेशारम्भः प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मविज्ञानान्नियमेन कर्तव्यानि श्रौतस्मार्तानि कर्माणीत्येवमर्थः, अनुशासनश्रुतेः पुरुषसंस्कारार्थत्वात् । संस्कृतस्य हि विशुद्धसत्त्वस्य आत्मज्ञानमञ्जसैवोपजायते । 'तपसा कल्मषं हन्ति विद्ययामृतमश्नुते' (मनु। १२ । १०४) इति हि स्मृतिः । वक्ष्यति च 'तपसा ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व' (तै।उप्। ३ । २ । १) इति । अतो विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थमनुष्ठेयानि कर्माणि । अनुशास्तीत्यनुशासनशब्दादनुशासनातिक्रमे हि दोषोत्पत्तिः । प्रागुपन्यासाच्च कर्मणाम् । केवलब्रह्मविद्यारम्भाच्च पूर्वं कर्माण्युपन्यस्तानि । उदितायां च ब्रह्मविद्यायाम् 'अभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते' (तै। उ। २ । ७ । १) 'न बिभेति कुतश्चन' (तै। उ। २ । ९ ।

१) 'किमहं साधु नाकरवम्' (तै। उ। २ । ९ । १) इत्यादिना कर्मनैष्किञ्चन्यं दर्शयिष्यति ।

अतः अवगम्यते पूर्वोपचितदुरितक्षयद्वारेण विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थानि कर्माणीति

Tai.Up. 1.11.1 Bh.

The instruction about duties in the text commencing with 'Having taught the Vedas', is meant to indicate that before the realization of Brahman the duties inculcated in the Vedas and Smrtis are to be performed regularly; because the Vedic reference to postinstruction (i.e. instruction after the study of the Vedas, implied in anusasti) is meant for creating proper tendencies is a man; for in accordance with the Smrti, 'He eradicates sin through austerities, and attains immortality through knowledge' (M.XII. 104), **the knowledge of the Self dawns easily on one who has the proper mental disposition and whose mind is purified**. And this Upanisad will say, 'Crave to know Brahman well through concentration (austerity' (III.ii). Therefore, duties are to be undertaken so that knowledge may emerge. From the mention of injunction implied in the expression, 'imparts this postinstruction', it follows that guilt will be the consequence of transgression of the command. Moreover, there is the fact of the earlier treatment of the rites etc. **Rites etc. have been dealt with before the introduction of the absolute knowledge of Brahman**. And this Upanisad will show the absence of rites etc., after the

rise of knowledge, in such passages as, '(whenever the aspirant) gets fearlessly establised (in Brahman)' (II. vii), '(The enlightened man) is not afraid of anything' (II. ix). '(Him, indeed, this remorse does not afflict): Why did I not perform good deeds?' (II.ix). Hence it is known that duties are calculated to lead to the dawn of knowledge through the eradication of sins accumulated in the past.

न च अत्र नित्यानित्यसंयोग-विरोध आशङ्क्यः । कर्माभेदेऽपि संयोगभेदात् । नित्यो हि एकः संयोगो यावज्जीवादिवाक्य-कल्पितः । न तस्य विद्याफलत्वम् । अनित्यस्तु अपरः संयोगः 'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।४।२२) इत्यादिवाक्य-कल्पितः । तस्य विद्याफलत्वम् -

BSBh. 3.4.33

In this case, no doubt should be entertained about any contradiction as between permanent and non-permanent connection with religious actions (Karma), because there may well be differences in connection even when there is no difference in religious actions. The connection implied by the statement about (Agnihotra) having to be performed as long as life lasts is a permanent connection, and knowledge (of the Self) is not its fruit.

स्वे स्वे यथोक्तलक्षणभेदे कर्मणि अभिरतः तत्परः संसिद्धिं स्वकर्मानुष्ठानात् अशुद्धिक्षये सति कार्येन्द्रियाणां ज्ञाननिष्ठायोग्यतालक्षणां संसिद्धिं लभते प्राप्नोति नरः अधिकृतः पुरुषः

BGh. 18.45

Being devoted to his own duty, which has different characteristics as stated above, man, the person qualified therefore, attains, complete success, characterized as the ability for steadfastness in Knowledge, which follows from the elimination of the impurities of body and mind as a result of fulfilling his own duty.

Section 198

References:

न हि, 'प्रतिबन्धक्षयादेव विद्योत्पद्यते, न त्वीश्वरप्रसादतपोध्यानाद्यनुष्ठानात्' इति नियमोऽस्ति ; अहिंसाब्रह्मचर्यादीनां च विद्यां प्रत्युपकारकत्वात् , साक्षादेव च कारणत्वाच्छ्रवणमननिदिध्यासनादीनाम् । अतः सिद्धान्याश्रमान्तराणि । सर्वेषां चाधिकारो विद्यायाम् , परं च श्रेयः केवलाया विद्याया एवेति सिद्धम्

Tai.Up.1.11.2-4 Bh.

There is surely no such rule that knowledge arises from the mere elimination of the obstructions alone, and not from the grace of God or the practice of austerity, meditation, etc., for (as a matter of fact) noninjury,

celibacy, etc. are aids to enlightenment; and hearing, thinking, and meditating are the direct causes of it. Hereby is established the need of other stages of life, and it is also proved that people in all the stages of life can aspire for knowledge, and that the supreme goal is attainable through knowledge alone.

तस्माद् विद्या-संयुक्तं नित्यमग्निहोत्रादि विद्या-विहीनं च उभयमपि । मुमुक्षुणा मोक्षप्रयोजनोद्देशेन इह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे च प्राग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः कृतं यत् । तद्यथासामर्थ्यं । ब्रह्माधिगमप्रतिबन्ध-कारणोपात्तदुरितक्षयहेतुत्व-द्वारेण ब्रह्माधिगम-कारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यमानं । श्रवणमननश्रद्धातात्पर्याद्यन्तरङ्ग-कारणापेक्षं ब्रह्मविद्यया सह एककार्यं भवतीति स्थितम्

BSBh. 4.1.18

It is thus established, that the compulsory routine Agnihotra, whether connected with Vidyā or not so connected, and performed by an aspirant for liberation, with the desire for such liberation as its fruit, prior to the generation of the knowledge (of Brahman), whether during the present or previous birth, and which in proportion to its power, becomes the cause of the realization of Brahman, by way of causing the annihilation of the aggregate of sins which constitute an impediment to such realization (of Brahman), and which is helpful to such **internal causes as, hearing, contemplating, faith (trust) and steadfast devotion, thus becomes a collaborator (as**

a support) of Brahma-Vidyā in the production of the same result, viz. liberation.

ऊर्ध्व-रेतःसु च आश्रमेषु विद्या श्रूयते । न च तत्र कर्माङ्गत्वं विद्याया उपपद्यते । कर्माभावात् । न हि अग्निहोत्रादीनि वैदिकानि कर्माणि तेषां सन्ति

BSBh. 3.4.17

The Scriptures mention knowledge (i.e. Vidyā of the Self) in connection with the order of those who observe continence (i.e. the Sannyāsins). That, in that order (of Sannyāsins), knowledge (i.e. Vidyā of the Self) can be subservient to religious actions is not reasonably sustainable. In as much as religious action is contra-indicated i.e., totally absent in that order. The Sannyāsins do not perform such scriptural religious actions as the Agnihotra etc.

Section 199

References:

सम्यग्-दर्शन-निष्ठानां सन्न्यासिनां सद्यो मुक्तिः उक्ता। कर्म-योगश् च ईश्वरार्पित-सर्व-भावेन ईश्वरे ब्रह्मणि आधाय क्रियमाणः सत्त्व-सुद्धि-ज्ञान-प्राप्ति-सर्व-कर्म-सन्न्यास-क्रमेण मोक्षाय इति भगवान् पदे पदे अब्रवीद्, वक्ष्यति च । अथ इदानीं ध्यान-योगं सम्यग्-दर्शनस्य अन्तर्-

अङ्गं विस्तरेण वक्ष्यामि इति, तस्य सूत्र-स्थानीयान् श्लोकान् उपदिशति स्म -

BGh. 5.26

Immediate liberation of the monks who are steadfast in full realization has been stated. And the Lord has said, and will say, **at every stage that Karma-yoga, undertaken as a dedication to Brahman, to the Lord, by surrendering all activities [The activities of body, mind and organs] to the Lord, leads to liberation through the stages of purification of the heart, attainment of Knowledge, and renunciation of all actions**. Thereafter, now, with the idea, 'I shall speak elaborately of the yoga of meditation which is the proximate discipline for full realization,' the Lord gave instruction through some verses in the form of aphorisms:

स्मृतिष्वपि भगवद्गीताद्यासु अनभिसन्धाय फलम् अनुष्ठितानि यज्ञादीनि

मुमुक्षोर्ज्ञान-साधनानि भवन्तीति प्रपञ्चितम् । तस्माद् यज्ञादीनि शमदमादीनि च यथाश्रमं सर्वाण्येव आश्रमकर्माणि विद्योत्पत्तावपेक्षितव्यानि । तत्रापि 'एवंवित्' इति विद्यासंयोगात् । प्रत्यासन्नानि विद्यासाधनानि शमादीनि । विविदिषा-संयोगात्तु बाह्यतराणि यज्ञादीनीति विवेक्तव्यम्

BSBh. 3.4.27

It has been explained **in the Smṛtis such as Bhagavad-gītā that sacrifices performed without keeping an eye on the fruit, become the means of the attainment of the knowledge (of the Self) for him who desires liberation. Therefore, religious actions such as sacrifices etc., as also calmness and the control over sense-organs as prescribed for the different orders of life, are all to be considered as necessary for the generation of knowledge**. Even then, it should be well understood with due discrimination, that as between them (i.e. sacrifices etc. and calmness and control over sense-organs), in the expression "One who knows it to be so", because of their connection with knowledge, calmness and control over the sense-organs are the proximate i.e. inward means of the knowledge (of the Self), while sacrifices etc., because of their being connected with the desire of a man who knows thus, are the external means.

यस्तु परमात्मदर्शनविषये मनुनोक्तः आत्मयाजिशब्दः 'सम्पश्यन्नात्मयाजीऽ (मनु। १२ । ९१) इत्यत्र – समं पश्यन् आत्मयाजी भवतीत्यर्थः । अथवा भूतपूर्वगत्या – आत्मयाजी आत्मसंस्कारार्थं नित्यानि कर्माणि करोति – 'इदं मेऽनेनाङ्गं संस्क्रियतेऽ (शत। ब्रा। ११ । २ । ६ । १३) इति श्रुतेः ; तथा 'गार्भैर्होमैःऽ (मनु। २ । २७) इत्यादिप्रकरणे कार्यकरणसंस्कारार्थत्वं नित्यानां कर्मणां दर्शयति । संस्कृतश्च य आत्मयाजी तैः कर्मभिः समं द्रष्टुं समर्थो भवति, तस्य इह जन्मान्तरे वा समम्

आत्मदर्शनमुत्पद्यते । समं पश्यन् स्वाराज्यमधिगच्छतीत्येषोऽर्थः ; आत्मयाजिशब्दस्तु भूतपूर्वगत्या प्रयुज्यते ज्ञानयुक्तानां नित्यानां कर्मणां ज्ञानोत्पत्तिसाधनत्वप्रदर्शनार्थम्

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

The phrase 'sacrificer to the Self,' used toy Manu in connection with the knowledge of the Supreme Self in the stanza, 'Seeing (himself in all and all in himself) he becomes a sacrificer to the Self (and attains independence)' (M. XII. 91), means that simply by his sameness of vision he becomes a sacrificer to the Self. Or the phrase may have been used having regard to the aspirant's former condition. The sacrificer to the Self performs the regular rites for selfpurification, as we know from the Śruti text, 'This particular part of my body is being purified by this (rite)' (Ś. XI. 11. vi. 13). Similarly, the Smṛtis too in the passage, 'Through the sacrifices relating to conception,' etc. (M. II. 27), show that the regular rites purify the body and organs. Purified by those rites, the sacrificer to the Self attains the sameness of vision; either in this or in some future life he attains Self-realisation. The meaning is that by his sameness of vision he becomes independent. The phrase 'sacrificer to the Self' has been used having regard to his former condition—to show that the regular rites combined with meditation help towards realisation.

भवेदावृत्त्यानर्थक्यं तं प्रति, यः 'तत्त्वमसि' (छन्।उप्। ६।८।७) इति सकृदुक्तमेव ब्रह्मात्मत्वमनुभवितुं शक्नुयात् । यस्तु न शक्नोति, तं प्रति उपयुज्यत एव आवृत्तिः

BSBh. 4.1.2

that repetition may well be purposeless in the case of one, who, when the passage "That thou art" is addressed to him only once, is able to realize that Brahman is the Self (of all), but to one who is not so able to realize, repetition is useful.

Section 200

References:

श्रद्धातात्पर्यप्रणिपातादीनामहेतुत्वमिति चेत् – स्यान्मतम् – 'श्रद्धावांल्लभते ज्ञानं तत्परः संयतेन्द्रियःऽ (भ। गी। ४ । ३९) 'तद्विद्धि प्रणिपातेनऽ (भ। गी। ४ । ३४) इत्येवमादीनां श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितानां ज्ञानहेतूनामहेतुत्वम् , प्रजापतेरिव जन्मान्तरकृतधर्महेतुत्वे ज्ञानस्येति चेत् । न ; निमित्तविकल्पसमुच्चयगुणवदगुणवत्त्वभेदोपपत्तेः । लोके हि नैमित्तिकानां कार्याणां निमित्तभेदोऽनेकधा विकल्प्यते । तथा निमित्तसमुच्चयः । तेषां च विकल्पितानां समुच्चितानां च पुनर्गुणवदगुणवत्त्वकृतो भेदो भवति । तद्यथा – रूपज्ञान एव तावन्नैमित्तिके कार्ये तमसि विनालोकेन चक्षूरूपसन्निकर्षो नक्तञ्चराणां रूपज्ञाने निमित्तं भवति मन एव केवलं रूपज्ञाननिमित्तं योगिनाम् । अस्माकं तु सन्निकर्षालोकाभ्यां सह तथादित्यचन्द्राद्यालोकभेदैः समुच्चिता निमित्तभेदा भवन्ति ।

तथालोकविशेषगुणवदगुणवत्त्वेन भेदाः स्युः । एवमेवात्मैकत्वज्ञानेऽपि क्वचिज्जन्मान्तरकृतं कर्म निमित्तं भवति , यथा प्रजापतेः । क्वचित्तपो निमित्तम् ; 'तपसा ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व' (तै। उ। ३ । २ । १) इति श्रुतेः । क्वचित् 'आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद' (छा। उ। ६ । १४ । २) 'श्रद्धावांल्लभते ज्ञानम्' (भ। गी। ४ । ३९) 'तद्विद्धि प्रणिपातेन' (भ। गी। ४ । ३४) 'आचार्याद्धैव' (छा। उ। ४ । ९ । ३) 'ज्ञातव्यो द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यः' (बृ। उ। २ । ४ । ५), (बृ। उ। ४ । ५ । ६) इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्य एकान्तज्ञानलाभनिमित्तत्वं श्रद्धाप्रभृतीनाम् अधर्मादिनिमित्तवियोगहेतुत्वात् ।

वेदान्तश्रवणमननिदिध्यासनानां च साक्षाज्ज्ञेयविषयत्वात् ; पापादिप्रतिबन्धक्षये चात्ममनसोः, भूतार्थज्ञाननिमित्तस्वाभाव्यात् । तस्मादहेतुत्वं न जातु ज्ञानस्य श्रद्धाप्रणिपातादीनामिति

Br.Up. 1.4.2 Bh.

Objection: In that case qualities like faith, devotion and prostration (to the teacher) cease to be the means of knowledge. The Gītā, for instance, says, 'One who has faith and devotion and controls one's senses attains knowledge' (G. IV. 39), and 'Know it through prostration' (G. IV. 34). There are other texts from the Śrutis as well as Smṛtis which prescribe similar means for knowledge. Now, if knowledge is due to the merits of one's past life, as you say was the case with Prajapati, then the above means become useless.

Reply: No, for there may be differences as regards the means such as their alternation or combination, efficacy or inefficacy. In every day life, indeed, the differences of causes of effects, which are produced by causes, are variously thought of. Similarly, the causes are combined. Of these causes, thus thought of and combined, there may again, occur differences due to capability or incapability. It is as follows: Let us take the case of an effect produced by a cause, e.g. the perception of form. In the case of animals that move about in the 'night-time, the connection of the eye with the object in darkness serves as the cause of perception of form, without the aid of light, while in the case of the sages (Yogins), it is simply the mind that acts as the cause of perception of form. As for us, the causes become combined to produce difference, that is to say, there should be the connection of the eye with the object as well as light, to cause perception which may again cause differences in accordance with the nature of light viz. sunlight, moonlight, and the like. Similarly, difference of causes may arise in accordance with the quality of light, i.e. bright, dim etc. In the same way, in the case of knowledge of the unity of the Self also, the action done in a previous birth may at times serve as the cause, as in the case of Prajapati. Sometimes it is reflection (the result of austerity), for the Śruti says, 'Desire to know

Brahman through reflection' (Tai. III. iiiv. i). Sometimes faith and other things are the only causes of attaining knowledge, as we learn from such Śruti and Smṛti texts as the following: 'He only knows who has got a teacher' (Ch. VI. xiv. 2), 'One who has faith... attains knowledge' (G. IV. 39), 'Know it through prostration' (G. IV. 34), '(Knowledge received) from the teacher alone (is best)' (Ch. IV. ix. 3), '(The Self) is to be realised through hearing,' etc. (Br. II. iv. 5; IV. v. 6). for they are the means for the attainment of absolute knowledge since they are instrumental in removing the obstacles such as unrighteousness. And the **hearing, reflection and meditation (reflection) on Vedānta texts have a direct relation (or intimately connected) to Brahman which is to be known**, for they are naturally the causes to evoke the knowledge of Reality when the evils, connected with the body and mind, that obstruct it have been destroyed. **Therefore faith (trust), prostration and the like never cease to be the means of knowledge.**

Section 201

References:

आरुरुक्षोर्मुनेर्योगं कर्म कारणमुच्यते ।
योगारूढस्य तस्यैव शमः कारणमुच्यते ॥
BG 6.3 (smriti)

For a devotee who wishes to attain to Yoga, action is said to be the means. For the same (devotee), when he has attained to Yoga, quiescence (sama) is said to be the means.

तत्र आश्रमिणां कश्चित् योगमारुरुक्षुः भवति, आरूढश्च कश्चित् , अन्ये न आरुरुक्षवः न च आरूढाः ; तानपेक्ष्य 'आरुरुक्षोःऽ 'आरूढस्य चऽ इति विशेषणं विभागकरणं च उपपद्यत एवेति चेत् , न ; 'तस्यैवऽ इति वचनात् , पुनः योगग्रहणाच्च 'योगारूढस्यऽ इति

BGh. 6 Upod. Bh.

Objection: In the empirical world, among people belonging to the different stages of life, some one becomes an aspirant for ascending to (Dhyāna-) yoga, and some one has ascended to it, whereas others are neither trying to ascend nor have they ascended. May it not be said that regarding them (the third), it is certainly logical to specify and differentiate by saying 'for one wanting to ascend' and 'for one who has ascended'?

Reply: No, because of the statement, 'for that person...alone'; and the use of the word '(Dhyāna-) yoga' over again in, 'when he has ascended to (Dhyāna-) yoga'

य आसीत् पूर्वं योगमारुरुक्षुः, तस्यैव आरूढस्य शम एव कर्तव्यः कारणं योगफलं प्रति उच्यते इति । अतो न यावज्जीवं कर्तव्यत्वप्राप्तिः कस्यचिदपि कर्मणः

BGh. 6 Upod. Bh.

amounts to asserting that, in the case of that very person who was earlier trying to ascend to Yoga, inaction itself becomes a duty as a means to the fruition of Yoga when he has already ascended to it. Hence, no work whatsoever becomes a duty to be followed throughout life.

सर्व एते त्रयोऽप्याश्रमिणः यथोक्तैर्धर्मैः पुण्यलोका भवन्ति ; पुण्यो लोको येषां त इमे पुण्यलोका आश्रमिणो भवन्ति । अवशिष्टस्त्वनुक्तः परिव्राट् तुरीयः ब्रह्मसंस्थाः ब्रह्मणि सम्यक्स्थितः, सोऽमृतत्वं पुण्यलोकविलक्षणममरणभावमात्यन्तिकम् एति, न आपेक्षिकम् , देवाद्यमृतत्ववत् , पुण्यलोकात्पृथक् अमृतत्वस्य विभागकरणात्

Chand.Up. 7.23.1 Bh.

All these three belonging to the different stages of life become attainers of the virtuous worlds by following the virtues as mentioned above. The word punyalokah is derived in the sense of 'those who belong to the virtuous worlds'. Those belonging to the different stages of life become fit (for the virtuous worlds). The one who remains to be mentioned is the parivrat, the monk, brahmasamsthah, **fully established in Brahman he attains Immortality, which is different from the virtuous worlds and is the state of absolute Freedom from death. It is not relative immortality as that of the gods and others** because Immortality has been stated separately from the virtuous worlds.

ब्रह्मसंस्थ इति हि ब्रह्मणि परिसमाप्तिः । अनन्य-व्यापारता-रूपं तन्निष्ठत्वमभिधीयते । तच्च त्रयाणामाश्रमाणां न सम्भवति । स्वाश्रमविहितकर्माननुष्ठाने । प्रत्यवायश्रवणात्

BSBh. 3.4.20

Being established-in-Brahman means merging in Brahman and being establish in it is spoken of as having a firm stability in it, and being of the nature of having no other extraneous operational activity. That is not possible in the case of the other three orders of life, because failure to perform the religious duties prescribed for one's own order of life is understood to result in sin, according to the scriptural statements.

तदप्यसत् , सर्वोपनिषत्सु इतिहासपुराणयोगशास्त्रेषु च ज्ञानाङ्गत्वेन मुमुक्षोः सर्वकर्मसंन्यासविधानात् । आश्रमविकल्पसमुच्चयविधानाच्च श्रुतिस्मृत्योः

BGh. 3. Upod. Bh.

This, too, is wrong; for, in all the Upanishads, in the Itihasas, in the Purana, and in the Yogasastra, renunciation of all karma is enjoined on the seeker of moksha as an accessory to knowledge. Both in the sruti and in the smriti, a gradual passage (through the three orders to the fourth order) is enjoined, as well as a sudden jump (from any one of the three to the fourth order).

यच्च 'पूर्वैः पूर्वतरं कृतम्' (भ। गी। ४ । १५) 'कर्मणैव हि संसिद्धिमास्थिता जनकादयः' (भ। गी। ३ । २०) इति, तत्तु प्रविभज्य विज्ञेयम् । तत्कथम् ? यदि तावत् पूर्वे जनकादयः तत्त्वविदोऽपि प्रवृत्तकर्माणः स्युः, ते लोकसङ्ग्रहार्थम् 'गुणा गुणेषु वर्तन्ते' (भ। गी। ३ । २८) इति ज्ञानेनैव संसिद्धिमास्थिताः, कर्मसंन्यासे प्राप्तेऽपि कर्मणा सहैव संसिद्धिमास्थिताः, न कर्मसंन्यासं कृतवन्त इत्यर्थः । अथ न ते तत्त्वविदः । ईश्वरसमर्पितेन कर्मणा साधनभूतेन संसिद्धिं सत्त्वशुद्धिम् , ज्ञानोत्पत्तिलक्षणां वा संसिद्धिम् , आस्थिता जनकादय इति व्याख्येयम्

BGh. 2.10

As for the texts, '...as was performed earlier by the ancient ones' (Gita 4.15), 'For Janaka and others strove to attain Liberation through action itself' (Gita 3.20), they are to be understood analytically.

Objection: How so?

Vedāntin: As to that, if **Janaka and others of old remained engaged in activity even though they were knowers of Reality**, **they did so for preventing people from going astray, while remaining established in realization** verily through the knowledge that 'the organs rest (act) on the objects of the organs' (Gita 3.28). The idea is this that, though the occasion for renunciation of activity did arise, they remained established in realization along with actions; they did not give up their rites and duties. On the other hand, if they were not knowers of Reality, then the explanation should be this; Through the

discipline of dedicating rites and duties to the Lord, Janaka and others remained established in perfection (saṃsiddhi) either in the form of purification of mind or rise of Knowledge.

'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणिऽ (ई। उ। २) इत्यत्र अपरो विशेष आख्यायते । यद्यपि अत्र प्रकरणसामर्थ्यात् विद्वानेव – कुर्वन् – इति सम्बध्यते, तथापि विद्यास्तुतये कर्मानुज्ञानम् एतद्द्रष्टव्यम् ; 'न कर्म लिप्यते नरेऽ (ई। उ। २) इति हि वक्ष्यति । एतदुक्तं भवति – यावज्जीवं कर्म कुर्वत्यपि त्वयि विदुषि पुरुषे न कर्म लेपाय भवति, विद्यासामर्थ्यादिति – तदेवं विद्या स्तूयते

BSBh. 3.4.14

The Scriptural passage "Performing religious actions here (in this world) etc." (Is.Up. 2) can have another interpretation as follows: Even though on the strength of the chapter (Prakaraṇa), it is only one who possesses knowledge, that has any connection with the word 'doing', still it should be understood that this permission to perform religious action is for the glorification of the knowledge (of the Self). The Sūtrakāra will later on say – "Religious action does not affect you, who have the nature of a man" (Is.Up. 2). By this is meant – **Even if a person who has knowledge (of the Self) performs religious actions right throughout his life, such action does not affect him, because of the potency of**

knowledge and in this manner, knowledge (of the Self) is thus glorified.

तस्माद्विद्यासंयुक्तं नित्यमग्निहोत्रादि विद्याविहीनं च उभयमपि मुमुक्षुणा मोक्षप्रयोजनोद्देशेन इह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे च प्राग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः कृतं यत् , तद्यथासामर्थ्यं
ब्रह्माधिगमप्रतिबन्धकारणोपात्तदुरितक्षयहेतुत्वद्वारेण
ब्रह्माधिगमकारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यमानं
श्रवणमननश्रद्धातात्पर्याद्यन्तरङ्गकारणापेक्षं ब्रह्मविद्यया सह एककार्यं भवतीति स्थितम्

BSBh. 4.1.18

It is thus established, that the compulsory routine Agnihotra, whether connected with Vidyā or not so connected, and performed by an aspirant for liberation, with the desire for such liberation as its fruit, prior to the generation of the knowledge (of Brahman), whether during the present or previous birth, and which in proportion to its power, becomes the cause of the realization of Brahman, by way of causing the annihilation of the aggregate of sins which constitute an impediment to such realization (of Brahman) and which is helpful to such internal causes as, hearing, contemplating, faith (trust) and steadfast devotion, thus becomes a collaborator of Brahma-Vidyā in the production of the same result, viz. liberation.

Section 202

References:

स वा एष महानज आत्मा योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशस्तस्मिञ्छेते सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः सर्वस्याधिपतिः स न साधुना कर्मणा भूयान्नो एवासाधुना कनीयानेष सर्वेश्वर एष भूताधिपतिरेष भूतपाल एष सेतुर्विधरण एषां लोकानामसम्भेदाय तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसानाशकेनैतमेव विदित्वा मुनिर्भवति । एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति । एतद्ध स्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसः प्रजां न कामयन्ते किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां नोऽयमात्मायं लोक इति ते ह स्म पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति या ह्येव पुत्रैषणा सा वित्तैषणा या वित्तैषणा सा लोकैषणोभे ह्येते एषणे एव भवतः । स एष नेति नेत्यात्मागृह्यो न हि गृह्यतेऽशीर्यो न हि शीर्यतेऽसङ्गो न हि सज्यतेऽसितो न व्यथते न रिष्यत्येतमु हैवैते न तरत इत्यतः पापमकरवमित्यतः कल्याणमकरवमित्युभे उ हैवैष एते तरति नैनं कृताकृते तपतः

Br.Up. 4.4.22 (sruti)

That great, birthless Self which is identified with the intellect and is in the midst of the organs, lies in the ether that is within the heart. It is the controller of all, the lord of all, the ruler of all. It does not become better through good work nor worse through bad work. It is the lord of all, It is the ruler of all beings, It is the protector

of all beings. It is the bank that serves as the boundary to keep the different worlds apart. The Brāhmaṇas seek to know It through the study of the Vedas, sacrifices, charity, and austerity consisting in a dispassionate enjoyment of senseobjects. Knowing It alone one becomes a sage. Desiring this world (the Self) alone monks renounce their homes. This is (the reason for it): The ancient sages, it is said, did not desire children (thinking), 'What shall we achieve through children, we who have attained this Self, this world (result).' They, it is said, renounced their desire for sons, for wealth and for the worlds, and lived a mendicant life. That which is the desire for sons is the desire for wealth, and that which is the desire for wealth is the desire for the worlds, for both these are but desires. This self is That which has been described as 'Not this, not this.' It is imperceptible, for It is never perceived; undecaying, for It never decays; unattached, for It is never attached; unfettered—It never feels pain, and never suffers injury. (It is but proper) that the sage is never overtaken by these two thoughts, 'I did an evil act for this,' and 'I did a good act for this.' He conquers both of them. Things done or not done do not trouble him.

अनुष्ठेयम् आश्रमान्तरं बादरायण आचार्यो मन्यते - वेदेऽश्रवणाद् ।
अग्निहोत्रादीनां च अवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वात् तद्विरोधाद् अनधिकृतानुष्ठेयम्
आश्रमान्तरम् - इति हि इमां मतिं निराकरोति, गार्हस्थ्यवदेव
आश्रमान्तरमपि अनिच्छता प्रतिपत्तव्यमिति मन्यमानः । कुतः?
साम्यश्रुतेः । समा हि गार्हस्थ्येनाश्रमान्तरस्य परामर्शश्रुतिः दृश्यते -
'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः' (छन्।उप्। २।२३।१) इत्याद्या ।
यथा इह श्रुत्यन्तर-विहितमेव गार्हस्थ्यं परामृष्टम् ।
एवमाश्रमान्तरमपीति प्रतिपत्तव्यम् -

BSBh. 3.4.19

The teacher Bādarāyaṇa is of opinion that that other stage of life is something to be accomplished. The view that there is a contradiction because the other stage of life is stated in the Veda and, on the other hand, works such as the Agnihotra must necessarily be performed, and that, in order to remove this contradiction, that other stage of life must be entered upon by those only who are not qualified for active worship, he rejects; being of opinion that that other stage is to be entered upon, in the same way as the state of the householder, even by him who does not wish to do so. On what ground?'On account of the scriptural statement of equality.' For we have a passage viz. "(There are) three branches of Dharma" (Chand.Up. 2.23.1), which refers equally to that other stage as to the state of the householder. As the state of the householder which is enjoined in other

passages only is here referred to, so also that other stage of life.

विद्यत एव तु आश्रमान्तर-विधिश्रुतिः प्रत्यक्षा - 'ब्रह्मचर्यं समाप्य गृही भवेद्गृही भूत्वा वनी भवेद्वनी भूत्वा प्रव्रजेत्।

यदि वेतरथा ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेद्गृहाद्वा वनाद्वा' (जा। उ। ४) इति; न च इयं श्रुतिः अनधिकृतविषया शक्या वक्तुम् । अविशेषश्रवणात् । पृथग्विधानाच्च अनधिकृतानाम् - 'अथ पुनरेव व्रती वाऽव्रती वा स्नातको वाऽस्नातको वोत्सन्नाग्निरनग्निको वा' (जा। उ। ४) इत्यादिना

BSBh. 3.4.20

Of course, there is a direct scriptural statement enjoining the other orders of life, thus – **"Completing student-bachelorship (**brahmacārī**), he should become a householder, and after that he should become a hermit, and after that a Parivrājaka. Or if he so chooses, he may become a Parivrājaka directly after finishing student-bachelorship (**brahmacārī**), or after householdership, or after being a hermit" (Jāb. Up. 4).** It cannot be argued, that this scriptural statement relates to one who is not competent (to perform religious action), because of the absence of any special scriptural statement therein, and because there is a separate statement with regard to those who are incompetent (to perform religious actions), thus – "Whether he be one,

who has undertaken a vow or one who has not, whether he be an acolyte (a Snātaka) or a householder, or whether he has given up keeping a sacrificial fire or whether he is not competent to keep such fire" (Jāb. Up. 4).

परिव्राजकस्य तु । सर्वकर्म-संन्यासात् । प्रत्यवायो न सम्भवति अननुष्ठाननिमित्तः । शमदमादिस्तु तदीयो धर्मो ब्रह्मसंस्थाया उपोद्बलकः, न विरोधी । ब्रह्मनिष्ठत्वमेव हि तस्य शमदमाद्युपबृंहितं स्वाश्रम-विहितं कर्म । यज्ञादीनि च इतरेषाम् । तद्व्यतिक्रमे च तस्य प्रत्यवायः

BSBh. 3.4.20

In the case of a Parivrājaka, however, inasmuch as he happens to have renounced all religious actions, Sin as caused by the failure to perform religious actions, is not possible (in his case), while the duty of being peaceful and of exercising control over the sense-organs (far from being opposed to the condition of being firmly ensconced-in-Brahman) is, on the other hand, rather helpful to it. **The state of being firmly established-in-Brahman, as supported by his duty of maintaining the condition of being peaceful and in the proper control of his senses, is the only duty prescribed in his order of life**. While sacrifices etc. are of the others and their failure in these actions amounts to sin.

नित्यानि प्रत्यवायपरिहारार्थानि इति चेत् । न ; असंन्यासिविषयत्वात् प्रत्यवायप्राप्तेः । न हि अग्निकार्याद्यकरणात् संन्यासिनः प्रत्यवायः कल्पयितुं शक्यः, यथा ब्रह्मचारिणामसंन्यासिनामपि कर्मिणाम् । न तावत् नित्यानां कर्मणामभावादेव भावरूपस्य प्रत्यवायस्य उत्पत्तिः कल्पयितुं शक्या, 'कथमसतः सज्जायेत' (छा। उ। ६ । २ । २) इति असतः सज्जन्मासम्भवश्रुतेः । यदि विहिताकरणात् असम्भाव्यमपि प्रत्यवायं ब्रूयात् वेदः, तदा अनर्थकरः वेदः अप्रमाणमित्युक्तं स्यात् ; विहितस्य करणाकरणयोः दुःखमात्रफलत्वात्

BGh. 3. Upod. Bh.

Objection: The performance of obligatory duties is intended for the mere avoidance of the sin (of their omission).

Answer: No. For, the sin arises only in the case of one who has not formally entered the fourth order, the order of samnyasins. It is certainly (as the opponent must admit) not possible to imagine that a samnyasin will incur sin by omitting the worship of the sacred fire as students (Brahmacharins) do thereby incur when they are not yet samnyasins, i.e., when they have not formally renounced works. Neither is it, indeed, possible to imagine the generation of sin which is a bhava or positive effect out of the omission of the obligatory duties, which is an abhava or mere negation; for, that the generation of existence out of Nonexistence is impossible is taught by the sruti in the words "How can existence arise out of Nonexistence?" (Chan.Up. 6.2.2). If the Veda should

teach what is inconceivable to us, viz., that evil arises from the omission of prescribed duties, it is tantamount to saying that the Veda conduces to no good and is, therefore, no authority; for, performance and nonperformance alike would only produce pain.

अविदुषस्तर्हि ऋणानपाकरणे पारिव्राज्यानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् । न, प्राग्गार्हस्थ्यप्रतिपत्तेरृणित्वासम्भवादधिकारानारूढोऽपि ऋणी चेत्स्यात् , सर्वस्य ऋणित्वमित्यनिष्टं प्रसज्येत

Ait.Up.Upod Bh.

Objection: For the unillumined soul, then, there can be no monasticism before he clears the (three) debts.

Answer: Not so, because one does not become indebted before entering the householder's life. If one can become indebted irrespective of his obligation thereto, then all may as well become so, which (conclusion) will lead to undesirable consequences.

अथ एवं सति अविद्वद्विषयाणाम् आश्रमकर्मणां बलाबलविचारणायाम् , आत्मज्ञानोत्पादनं प्रति यमप्रधानानाम् अमानित्वादीनाम् मानसानां च ध्यानज्ञानवैराग्यादीनाम् सन्निपत्योपकारकत्वम् ;

हिंसारागद्वेषादिबाहुल्यात् बहुक्लिष्टकर्मविमिश्रिता इतरे – इति ; अतः पारिव्राज्यं मुमुक्षूणां प्रशंसन्ति – 'त्याग एव हि सर्वेषामुक्तानामपि कर्मणाम् । अतः पारिव्राज्यं मुमुक्षूणां प्रशंसन्ति – 'त्याग एव हि सर्वेषामुक्तानामपि कर्मणाम् । वैराग्यं पुनरेतस्य मोक्षस्य परमोऽवधिः (?) 'किं ते धनेन किमु बन्धुभिस्ते किं ते दारैर्ब्राह्मण यो मरिष्यसि

। आत्मानमन्विच्छ गुहां प्रविष्टं पितामहास्ते क्व गताः पिता चऽ (मो। ध। १७५ । ३८, २७७ । ३८) । एवं साङ्ख्ययोगशास्त्रेषु च सन्न्यासः ज्ञानं प्रति प्रत्यासन्न उच्यते ; कामप्रवृत्त्यभावाच्च ; कामप्रवृत्तेर्हि ज्ञानप्रतिकूलता सर्वशास्त्रेषु प्रसिद्धा । तस्मात् विरक्तस्य मुमुक्षोः विनापि ज्ञानेन 'ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेत्ऽ (जा। उ। ४) इत्यादि उपपन्नम्

Br.Up. 4.5.15 Bh.

Under the circumstances, if we examine the comparative efficacy, for bringing forth Self-knowledge, of the duties pertaining to the different orders of life, which **concern only the unenlightened, we find that virtues such as the absence of pride, which are mainly intended for the control of the senses, and meditation, discrimination, non-attachment, etc., which deal with the mind, are the direct aids**. The others, owing to the predominance of injury, attachment, aversion, etc. in them, are mixed up with a good deal of evil work. **Hence the monastic life is recommended for seekers after liberation**, as in the following passages, 'The giving up of all duties that have been described (as belonging to particular orders of life) is (best). Renunciation, again, is the culmination of this giving up of the duties,' 'O Brahmana, what will you do with wealth, or friends, or a wife, for you shall have to die? Seek the Self that has entered the cave of your intellect. Where are your grandfather and other ancestors gone, as well as your father?' (Mbh. XII. c1xxiv. 38). In the Samkhya and Yoga systems also renunciation is

spoken of as a direct means of knowledge. The absence of the impulsion of desire is another reason (why the seeker after liberation renounces the world). For all the scriptues tell us that the impulsion of desire is hostile to knowledge. Therefore, for a seeker after liberation who is disgusted with the world, the statement, 'He should renounce the world from the student life itself,' is quite reasonable, even if he without knowledge.

Section 203

References:

परिव्राजकस्य तु । सर्वकर्म-संन्यासात् । प्रत्यवायो न सम्भवति अननुष्ठाननिमित्तः । शमदमादिस्तु तदीयो धर्मो ब्रह्मसंस्थाया उपोद्बलकः, न विरोधी । ब्रह्मनिष्ठत्वमेव हि तस्य शमदमाद्युपबृंहितं स्वाश्रम-विहितं कर्म । यज्ञादीनि च इतरेषाम् । तद्व्यतिक्रमे च तस्य प्रत्यवायः ।

तथा च 'न्यास इति ब्रह्मा ब्रह्मा हि परः परो हि ब्रह्मा तानि वा एतान्यवराणि तपांसि न्यास एवात्यरेचयत्' (नारा। उ। ७८) । 'वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः' (मुन्।उप्। ३।२।६) (नारा। उ। १२-३) (कैव्।उप्। ३) इत्याद्याः श्रुतयः । स्मृतयश्च 'तद्बुद्धयस्तदात्मानस्तन्निष्ठास्तत्परायणाः' (ब्ग्।५।१७) इत्याद्याः - ब्रह्मसंस्थस्य कर्माभावं दर्शयन्ति

BSBh. 3.4.20

In the case of a Parivrājaka, however, inasmuch as he happens to have renounced all religious actions, sin as caused by the failure to perform religious actions, is not possible (in his case), while the duty of being peaceful and of exercising control over the sense-organs (far from being opposed to the condition of being firmly ensconced-in-Brahman) is, on the other hand, rather helpful to it. The state of being firmly established-in-Brahman, as supported by his duty of maintaining the condition of being peaceful and in the proper control of his senses, is the only duty prescribed in his order of life while sacrifices etc. are of the others, and their failure in these actions amounts to sin. Of similar import are scriptural statements such as "Renunciation is Brahman, Brahman is the Highest, the Highest is Brahman, these penances etc. are lower (in value) and renunciation excels them" (Nār. Up. 78), "Yatis (anchorites) who have determined well the meaning of the knowledge of Vedānta, and who by renunciation have become pure, (and obtained liberation (Mun.Up. 3.2.6; Nār. Up. 12.3.1; Kaiv.Up.3). The Smṛti also, by saying thus – "Having minds fixed in it and serving it with all their heart" (Gita 5.17) etc., indicates how a person having the ideal of being firmly established-in-Brahman has no religious duty to perform.

भेदप्रत्ययवान् अनुपमर्दितभेदबुद्धिर्विद्यया यः, स कर्मण्यधिकृत इत्यवोचाम ; यो हि अधिकृतः कर्मणि, तस्य तदकरणे प्रत्यवायः ; न निवृत्ताधिकारस्य, गृहस्थस्येव, ब्रह्मचारिणो विशेषधर्माननुष्ठाने

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

We say that a person who is possessed of the idea of duality, the person whose idea of duality has not been removed by Knowledge, becomes obliged to perform rites and duties because evil comes to the person who does not perform the rites even when he is under an obligation to do them. But not so in the case of one for whom such an obligation has ceased, just as no evil accrues to the householder who does not perform some special rite or duty prescribed for the the Brahmacarin.

अतश्चेदमेवैकं वेदोक्तं पारिव्राज्यम् , न यज्ञोपवीतत्रिदण्डकमण्डल्वादिपरिग्रह इति । 'मुण्डोऽपरिग्रहोऽसङ्गः' (जा। उ। ५) इति च । श्रुतिः 'अत्याश्रमिभ्यः परमं पवित्रम्' (श्वे। उ। ६ । २१) इत्यादि च श्वेताश्वतरीये ; 'निस्तुतिर्निर्नमस्कारः' (मो। ध। २४२ । ९) इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यश्च ; 'तस्मात्कर्म न कुर्वन्ति यतयः पारदर्शिनः । ' (मो। ध। २४१ । ७)'तस्मादलिङ्गो धर्मज्ञोऽव्यक्तलिङ्गः' (अश्व। ४६ । ५१) (व। १० । १२) इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यश्च

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

And hence, it follows that this alone is the monasticism mentioned in the Vedas, and not the acceptance of sacred thread, three staves (tied into one), waterpot, etc. The Vedas also state, 'Shavenheaded, not accepting any gift' (Ja.5), 'Without association'; and in the Svetasvatara

Upanisad it is stated, '(He spoke of the most sacred thing) to the people who had gone beyond the stages of life' (Sv.Up. 4.21). And on the authority of such Smrti texts as, 'Without praising anybody and without making any salutation', 'Therefore, the monks, who have seen That which is beyond this world, do not undertake rites and duties. Therefore, the knower of Reality has no outer sign and no insignia for recognition', etc. (it can be so concluded).

विज्ञानसमानकर्तृकात्पारिव्राज्यात् एषणाव्युत्थानलक्षणात् पारिव्राज्यान्तरोपपत्तेः ; यद्धि तत् एषणाभ्यो व्युत्थानलक्षणं पारिव्राज्यम् , तत् आत्मज्ञानाङ्गम् , आत्मज्ञानविरोध्येषणापरित्यागरूपत्वात् , अविद्याविषयत्वाच्चैषणायाः ; तद्व्यतिरेकेण च अस्ति आश्रमरूपं पारिव्राज्यं ब्रह्मलोकादिफलप्राप्तिसाधनम् , यद्विषयं यज्ञोपवीतादिसाधनविधानं लिङ्गविधानं च । न च एषणारूपसाधनोपादानस्य आश्रमधर्ममात्रेण पारिव्राज्यान्तरे विषये सम्भवति सति, सर्वोपनिषद्विहितस्य आत्मज्ञानस्य बाधनं युक्तम् , यज्ञोपवीताद्यविद्याविषयैषणारूपसाधनोपादित्सायां च अवश्यम् असाधनफलरूपस्य अशनायादिसंसारधर्मवर्जितस्य अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति विज्ञानं बाध्यते । न च तद्बाधनं युक्तम् , सर्वोपनिषदां तदर्थपरत्वात्

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

for we know that there is another kind of monasticism different from this one. The latter is connected with the same individual as Self-knowledge and is characterised

by the renunciation of desires. This monasticism is a part of Self-knowledge because it is the renunciation of desires, which contradict Self-knowledge and are within the province of ignorance. Besides this there is another kind of monasticism, which is an order of life and leads to the attainment of the world of Hiraṇyagarbha and so on; it is about this that means such as the holy thread and particular insignia are enjoined. When there is this other kind of monasticism in which the adoption of means like the (auxiliaries of) desires is just a duty peculiar to that life, it is wrong to contradict Self-knowledge that is enjoined by all the Upaniṣads. If one seeks to adopt means such as the holy thread, which are within the province of ignorance and are (auxiliaries of) desires, it would certainly be contradicting the knowledge of one's self—which is neither the means nor the result of an action, and is devoid of such relative attributes as hunger—as identical with Brahman. And it is wrong to contradict this knowledge, for all the Upaniṣads aim at this.

विविक्त-सेवी अरण्यनदीपुलिनगिरिगुहादीन् विविक्तान् देशान् सेवितुं शीलम् अस्य इति विविक्तसेवी, लघ्वाशी लघ्वशनशीलः - विविक्तसेवालघ्वशनयोः निद्रादिदोषनिवर्तकत्वेन चित्तप्रसादहेतुत्वात् ग्रहणम्, यत-वाक्-काय-मानसः वाक् च कायश्च मानसं च यतानि संयतानि यस्य ज्ञाननिष्ठस्य सः ज्ञाननिष्ठः यतिः यतवाक्कायमानसः

स्यात् । एवम् उपरतसर्वकरणः सन् ध्यान-योग-परः ध्यानम् आत्मस्वरूपचिन्तनम्, योगः आत्मविषये एकाग्रीकरणम् तौ परत्वेन कर्तव्यौ यस्य सः ध्यानयोगपरः नित्यं नित्यग्रहणं मन्त्रजपाद्यन्यकर्तव्याभावप्रदर्शनार्थम्, वैराग्यं विरागस्य भावः दृष्टादृष्टेषु विषयेषु वैतृष्ण्यं समुपाश्रितः सम्यक् उपाश्रितः नित्यमेव इत्यर्थः

BGh. 18.52-53

One who resorts to solitude, is habituated to repairing into such solitary places as a forest, bank of a river, mountain caves, etc. eats sparingly, is habituated to eating a little – repairing to solitary places and eating sparingly are mentioned here since they are the causes of tranquillity of mind through the elimination of defects like sleep etc. the person steadfast in Knowledge, who has speech, body and mind under control. That monk, steadfast in Knowledge, should have his speech, body and mind under control. Having all his organs withdrawn thus, one to whom meditation and concentration are ever the highest (duty) – meditation is thinking of the real nature of the Self, and concentration is making the mind one-pointed with regard to the Self itself; one to whom these meditation and concentration are the highest (duty) is (ever) is used to indicate the absence of other duties like repetition of mantra. etc., one who is fully possessed, that is ever possessed; of dispassion, absence of longing for objects seen or unseen.

तत्र
परमहंसानामसंवर्तकारुणिश्वेतकेतुदुर्वासऋभुनिदाघजड
भरतदत्तात्रेयरैवतक-
प्रभृतयोऽव्यक्तलिङ्गा अव्यक्ताचारा अनुन्मत्ता
उन्मत्तवदाचरन्तस्त्रिदण्डं कमण्डलुं शिक्यं पात्रं
जलपवित्रं शिखां यज्ञोपवीतं च इत्येतत्सर्वं
भूःस्वाहेत्यप्सु परित्यज्यात्मानमन्विच्छेत्

Jabala.Up. 6

There are sages called Paramahamsas (as in the days of yore, the sages) Samvartaka, Aruni, Svetaketu, Durvasas, Ribhu, Nidagha, Jadabharata, Dattatreya, Raivataka and others, wearing no distinguishing marks, with conduct beyond the ken (of worldly people) and who behaved as though bereft of their senses though (perfectly) sane. Discarding all these, namely the threefold staff (of bamboo), the water pot, the sling (to carry personal effects), the (alms-)bowl, the cloth for purifying water (tied to the staff), tuft of hair and sacred thread in water (i.e. a reservoir) by reciting 'Bhuh Svaha', the Paramahamsa shall seek the Atman.

Section 204

References:

एवमौपनिषदात्मोपासनप्रकरणस्यात्मोपासनविध्युद्देशत्वेनैवोपयोगः । 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ। उ। २ । ३ । ६) 'अस्थूलम्ऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ८ । ८) 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्ऽ (छा। उ। ६ । २ । १) 'अशनायाद्यतीतःऽ (बृ। उ। ३ । ५ । १) इत्येवमादिवाक्यानामुपास्यात्मस्वरूपविशेषसमर्पणेनोपयोगः । फलं च मोक्षोऽविद्यानिवृत्तिर्वा

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

similarly, the section of the Upaniṣads dealing with meditation on the Self must be used only as part of the injunction regarding this meditation. Such passages as 'Not this, not this' (Br.Up. 2.3.6), 'Not. gross,' (Br.Up. 3.8.8), 'One only without a second' (Ch.Up. 6.2.1), 'Beyond hunger etc.' (Br.Up. 3.5.1, adapted), are to be used as setting forth the particular nature of the Self, the object of meditation and the result is liberation or the cessation of ignorance.

द्रष्टव्यविधेर्विषयसमर्पकाण्येतानीति चेत् । न ; अर्थान्तराभावादित्युक्तोत्तरत्वात् – आत्मवस्तुस्वरूपसमर्पकैरेव वाक्यैः 'तत्त्वमसिऽ (छा। उ। ६ । ८ । ७) इत्यादिभिः श्रवणकाल एव तद्दर्शनस्य कृतत्वाद्द्रष्टव्यविधेर्नानुष्ठानान्तरं कर्तव्यमित्युक्तोत्तरमेतत्

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Objection: Do they not supply the object for the injunction about realising the Self?

Reply: No, for we have already answered that point by saying that there is no reference to anything else in those passages. That is to say, since sentences such as,

‘Thou art That,’ which only delineate the nature of the Self, immediately lead to Its realisation, there is no further action to be done with regard to the injunction about that realisation.

निरोधस्तर्हर्यर्थान्तरमिति चेत् अथापि स्याच्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधस्य वेदवाक्यजनितात्मविज्ञानादर्थान्तरत्वात् ,
तन्त्रान्तरेषु च कर्तव्यतया अवगतत्वाद्विधेयत्वमिति चेत् । न, मोक्षसाधनत्वेनानवगमात् । न हि वेदान्तेषु ब्रह्मात्मविज्ञानादन्यत्परमपुरुषार्थसाधनत्वेनावगम्यते । ‘आत्मानमेवावेत्तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्s ‘ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्s (तै। उ। २ । १ । १) ‘स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवतिs (मु। उ। ३ । २ । ९) ‘आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेदs‘तस्य तावदेव चिरम्s (छा। उ। ६ । १४ । २) ‘अभयं हि वै ब्रह्म भवति । य एवं वेदs (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २५) इत्येवमादिश्रुतिशतेभ्यः । अनन्यसाधनत्वाच्च निरोधस्य – न ह्यात्मविज्ञानतत्स्मृतिसन्तानव्यतिरेकेण चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधस्य साधनमस्ति । अभ्युपगम्येदमुक्तम् ; न तु ब्रह्मविज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण अन्यत् मोक्षसाधनमवगम्यते

Br.Up. 1.4.7 Bh.

Objection: Well then, the control of the mind may be something different. In other words, since the control of mental states is something different from the knowledge of the Self arising from the Vedic texts, and since we know this has been prescribed for practice in another system (Yoga), let this be enjoined.

Reply: No, for it is not known as a means of liberation. In the Upaniṣads **nothing is spoken of as a means to the attainment of the highest end of man except the knowledge of the identity of the self and Brahman**. Witness hundreds of Śruti texts like the following: 'It knew only Itself.... Therefore It became all', 'The knower of Brahman attains the highest (Tai.Up. 2.2.1), 'He who knows that Supreme Brahman becomes Brahman' (Mund.Up. 3.2.9), 'He only knows who has got a teacher. It takes him only so long (as he does not give up the body)' (Ch.Up. 6.14.2),'He who knows it as such indeed becomes the fearless Brahman' (Br.Up. 4.4.25). Besides there is no other means for the control of mental states except the knowledge of the Self and the train of remembrance about it. We have said this as a tentative admission; **really, we know of no other means of liberation except the knowledge of Brahman.**

निराकरणं तु - न सांख्यज्ञानेन वेदनिरपेक्षेण योगमार्गेण वा निःश्रेयसमधिगम्यत इति । श्रुतिर्हि वैदिकादात्मैकत्वविज्ञानादन्यन्निःश्रेयससाधनं वारयति - 'तमेव विदित्वाति मृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' (स्वे।उप्। ३।८) इति । द्वैतिनो हि ते सांख्या योगाश्च नात्मैकत्वदर्शिनः । यत्तु दर्शनमुक्तम् 'तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाभिपन्नम्' इति, वैदिकमेव तत्र ज्ञानं ध्यानं च सांख्ययोगशब्दाभ्यामभिलप्येते प्रत्यासत्तेरित्यवगन्तव्यम्

BSBh. 2.1.3

The refutation (of the above) is, that final beatitude is not attained by the mere knowledge of Sāṅkhya Smṛti or the path of Yoga, without reference to the Veda. The Scriptures obviate the possibility of any other means of attaining liberation, except the knowledge of the unity of the Self referred to in the Vedas, thus – "It is by knowing that (Ātmā i.e., Brahman) alone, that a person transcends death, and there is no other path to liberation" (Sve.Up. 3.8). The followers of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga doctrines are dualists and do not countenance the unity of the Self. As to the instance quoted – viz. "That cause which is known from the Sāṅkhya and Yoga" – It should be understood that by the words "Sāṅkhya and Yoga", only knowledge and meditation as understood by the scriptures is meant, because of their proximity (to the subject).

न, नीलपीतादिशब्दैः वर्णवाचकैः सह अनुद्रवणात् ; यान् शुक्लादीन् योगिनो मोक्षपथान् आहुः, न ते मोक्षमार्गाः ; संसारविषया एव हि ते – 'चक्षुष्टो वा मूर्ध्नो वान्येभ्यो वा शरीरदेशेभ्यः' (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २) इति शरीरदेशान्निःसरणसम्बन्धात् , ब्रह्मादिलोकप्रापका हि ते

Br.Up. 4.4.9 Bh.

Not so, for it is enumerated along with the words, 'blue,' 'yellow,' etc., denoting colour. The white and other paths that the Yogins designate as the paths of liberation, are not really such, for they fall within the range of relative existence. They merely lead to the world of

Hiraṇyagarbha and so on, for they relate to the exit through particular parts of the body: ‘Through the eye, or through the head, or through any other part of the body’ (Br.Up. 4.4.2).

Section 205

References:

केचित्तु सर्वमेव निवृत्तिकारणं मन्यन्ते । अतः कारणात् – पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मात् मृत्योर्मुच्यते उत्तरमुत्तरं प्रतिपद्यमानः – व्यावृत्त्यर्थमेव प्रतिपद्यते, न तु तादर्थ्यम् – इत्यतः आद्वैतक्षयात् सर्वं मृत्युः, द्वैतक्षये तु परमार्थतो मृत्योराप्तिमतिमुच्यते । अतश्च आपेक्षिकी गौणी मुक्तिरन्तराले ।

सर्वमेतत् एवम् अबार्हदारण्यकम् । ननु सर्वैकत्वं मोक्षः, ‘तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्s (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १०) इति श्रुतेः ।

बाढं भवत्येतदपि ; न तु ‘ग्रामकामो यजेतs (तै। आ। १२ । १० । ४) ‘पशुकामो यजेतs (तै। आ। १६ । १२ । ८) इत्यादिश्रुतीनां तादर्थ्यम् ; यदि हि अद्वैतार्थत्वमेव आसाम् , ग्रामपशुस्वर्गाद्यर्थत्वं नास्तीति ग्रामपशुस्वर्गादयो न गृह्येरन् ; गृह्यन्ते तु कर्मफलवैचित्र्यविशेषाः । यदि च वैदिकानां कर्मणां तादर्थ्यमेव, संसार एव नाभविष्यत् । अथ तादर्थ्येऽपि अनुनिष्पादितपदार्थस्वभावः संसार इति चेत् । यथा च रूपदर्शनार्थ आलोके सर्वोऽपि तत्रस्थः प्रकाश्यत एव । न, प्रमाणानुपपत्तेः ; अद्वैतार्थत्वे वैदिकानां कर्मणां विद्यासहितानाम् ,

अन्यस्यानुनिष्पादितत्वे प्रमाणानुपपत्तिः – न प्रत्यक्षम् , नानुमानम् , अत एव च न आगमः । उभयम् एकेन वाक्येन प्रदर्श्यत इति चेत् , कुल्याप्रणयनालोकादिवत् । तन्नैवम् , वाक्यधर्मानुपपत्तेः ; न च एकवाक्यगतस्यार्थस्य प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिसाधनत्वमवगन्तुं शक्यते ; कुल्याप्रणयनालोकादौ अर्थस्य प्रत्यक्षत्वाददोषः

Br.Up. 3.2.1 Bh.

Some, however, consider every rite to be leading to the cessation of bondage. Therefore, they say, he who resorts to the succeeding forms of death (bodies) is freed from the preceding forms of it: he resorts to the former not to cling to them, but to turn away from them; so, everything is a form of death until duality is at an end, and when this takes place, he really transcends death. Hence, they say, the intermediate liberation is but a relative and secondary one. All this, we say, is unwarranted by the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.

Objection: Does not liberation consist in identity with all, as is borne out by the Śruti text, 'Therefore It became all' (Br.Up. 1.4.10)?

Reply: Yes, it does, but such Śruti texts as, 'One who desires villages must sacrifice' (Tā. XVII. x. 4), and 'One who desires animalś must sacrifice' (Tā. XVI. xii. 8), do not convey liberation. If they did, they would not signify villages, cattle, heaven, etc., and hence the latter would

not be understood as such. But they are considered to be the varied results of our past actions.

Moreover, if the Vedic rites conveyed liberation, there would be no relative existence at all.

Objection: We maintain that although identity is the purport of those passages, yet relative existence is the very nature of rites, which follow automatically (from a knowledge of the Vedic injunctions), as when a lamp is lighted to show a particular form, everything in that place is brought to light.

Reply: Not so, for it is unwarranted by any means of knowledge. In other words, if the Vedic rites together with meditation convey only identity, there is nothing to prove that bondage follows automatically (from a knowledge of the Vedic injunctions). There is neither perception, nor for that very reason inference, nor scriptural evidence.

Objection: But both identity and relative exist ence may be conveyed by the same sentence, as light or the digging of a canal, for instance, serves multiple purposes.

Reply: It cannot be, for it would be against the laws of sentences. Nor can you say that the import of a sentence (here, rites) serves both to initiate bondage and to stop it. The examples of light, the digging of a canal, and so forth are in order, because their uses are matters of perception.

इति एवं त्रिशङ्कोः ऋषेः ब्रह्मभूतस्य ब्रह्मविदः वेदानुवचनम् , वेदः वेदनम् आत्मैकत्वविज्ञानम् , तस्य प्राप्तिमनु वचनं वेदानुवचनम् । आत्मनः कृतकृत्यताप्रख्यापनार्थं वामदेववत्त्रिशङ्कुना आर्षेण दर्शनेन दृष्टो मन्त्राम्नाय आत्मविद्याप्रकाशक इत्यर्थः । अस्य च जपो विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थोऽधिगम्यते । 'ऋतं च' इति धर्मोपन्यासादनन्तरं च वेदानुवचनपाठादेतदवगम्यते । एवं श्रौतस्मार्तेषु नित्येषु कर्मसु युक्तस्य निष्कामस्य परं ब्रह्म विविदिषोरार्षाणि दर्शनानि प्रादुर्भवन्त्यात्मादिविषयाणीति

Tai.Up. 1.10.4 Bh.

thus (iti) was the statement (vacanam) after the attainment of the realization (vedah, i.e. vedanam) of the unity of the Self of Trisankua seer who had known Brahman and become Brahman. This statement (of his) was for the sake of expressing the fact that he had reached fulfilment, just like Vamadeva (Ai. II. 5). The idea is that the traditional text in the form of the mantra, as visualized by Trisanku with the eyes of a seer, reveals the knowledge of the Self. And it is understood that the self-repetition of this mantra is calculated to lead to knowledge. From the introduction of duty in the chapter commencing with, 'Righteousness and ....' (I. ix), and the conclusion later on with the text, 'Thus was the statement after the attainment of realization', it becomes evident that the visions of the seers, with regad to the Self etc., become revealed to one who engages thus in the obligatory duties enjoined in the Vedas and Smrtis, who

is devoid of selfish motives, and who hankers after the realization of the supreme Brahman.

ये हि परविद्याधिकारे केचित्प्रपञ्चा उच्यन्ते, यथा - 'युक्ता ह्यस्य हरयः शता दशेति। अयं वै हरयोऽयं वै दश च सहस्राणि बहूनि चानन्तानि च' (ब्र।उप्। २।५।१९) इत्येवमादयः - ते भवन्तु प्रविलयार्थाः । तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरमबाह्यम्' (ब्र।उप्। २।५।१९) इत्युपसंहारात्।
ये पुनरुपासनाधिकारे प्रपञ्चा उच्यन्ते, यथा - 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरो भारूपः' (छन्।उप्। ३।१४।२) इत्येवमादयः - न तेषां प्रविलयार्थत्वं न्याय्यम् ।
'स क्रतुं कुर्वीत' (छन्।उप्। ३।१४।१) इति एवंजातीयकेन प्रकृतेनैव उपासन-विधिना तेषां सम्बन्धात् । श्रुत्या च एवंजातीयकानां गुणानाम् उपासनार्थत्वेऽवकल्पमाने । न लक्षणया प्रविलयार्थत्वम् अवकल्पते । सर्वेषां च साधारणे प्रविलयार्थत्वे सति 'अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्' (ब्रस्।३।२।१४) इति विनिगमनकारणवचनम् । अनवकाशं स्यात् । फलमप्येषां यथोपदेशं
क्वचिद्दुरितक्षयः, क्वचिदैश्वर्यप्राप्तिः, क्वचित्क्रममुक्तिः इत्यवगम्यत एव - इत्यतः पार्थगर्थ्यमेव उपासनावाक्यानां ब्रह्मवाक्यानां च न्याय्यम् । न एकवाक्यत्वम्

BSBh. 3.2.21

The variety of worldly manifestations referred to in the chapter dealing with the Vidyā of the Highest Brahman, thus – "This Highest Self (in the form of a Jīva-Self) has ten, hundred horses (i.e. sense-organs) attached to him. The same Highest Self is in the form of ten, a thousand,

many and innumerable horses" (Br.Up. 2.5.19), is of course intended to be ultimately dissolved. Because the topic has been concluded thus –
"This is Brahman, which is without cause, without effect, without anything inside or outside (of it)" (Br.Up. 2.5.19). But it is not logical to understand that the variety of worldly manifestations again, which is referred to in the chapter dealing with deep meditation,
Such as "He whose structure is the mind, whose body is Prāṇa and whose nature is refulgence" (Chan.Up. 3.14.2), is also intended to be dissolved. Because these passages have a direct connection with the injunction for deep meditation (Upāsanā) which is relevant there, such as –
"He should make a resolution (Kratu)" (Chan.Up. 3.14.1). And when the scriptures themselves intend that such kinds of attributes (of Brahman) are for the purpose of deep meditation, it cannot be maintained by way of an implication (lakṣaṇā) that they are meant for the purpose of their ultimate effacement, if all these (Texts) are to have the common purpose of the ultimate effacement (of the variety of worldly manifestations), the reason indicated in BrS.3.2.14, viz. – "It is of course devoid of any form because that is the chief purport (of scriptural passages)", would have no scope at all. **It is also understood according to the scriptural instruction, that these deep meditations on Brahman as having such forms have**

fruit such as that sometimes it is the destruction of sin, sometimes the attainment of power and sometimes liberation by stages (Krama-Mukti). And hence it is logical (to understand) that the passages setting out deep meditations and passages purely dealing with Brahman as such, have different meanings, and are not compatible.

Section 206

References:

आत्मानं चेद्विजानीयादयमस्मीति पूरुषः । किमिच्छन्कस्य कामाय शरीरमनुसञ्ज्वरेत्

Br.Up. 4.4.12 (sruti)

If a man knows the Self as 'I am this,' then desiring what and for whose sake will he suffer in the wake of the body?

इति गुह्यतमं शास्त्रमिदमुक्तं मयानघ । एतद्बुद्ध्वा बुद्धिमान्स्यात्कृतकृत्यश्च भारत

BG 15.20 (smriti)

Thus, this most Secret Science has been taught by Me, O sinless one; on knowing this, (a man) becomes wise, O Bharata and all his duties are accomplished.

नावगतब्रह्मात्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम् ।

वेदप्रमाणजनित-ब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्

BSBh. 1.1.4

It is not possible to show that he who has once understood the condition of the Self's unity (identity) with Brahman, still continues to be affected by the transmigratory condition, because it is contradictory to the condition of the unity (identity) of the Self with Brahman achieved on scriptural authority.

तस्मात् सर्वदुःख-विनिर्मुक्तैकचैतन्यात्मकोऽहमित्येष आत्मानुभवः । न च एवम् आत्मानमनुभवतः किञ्चिदन्यत्कृत्यम् अवशिष्यते । तथा च श्रुतिः - 'किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां नोऽयमात्मायं लोकः' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।४।२२), इत्यात्मविदः कर्तव्याभावं दर्शयति । स्मृतिरपि -
'यस्त्वात्मरतिरेव स्यादात्मतृप्तश्च मानवः।
आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टस्तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते' (ब्ग्। ३।१७) इति

BSBh. 4.1.2

Therefore, the **realization of the Self, is the realization that 'I am the Self', characterized only by sentiency (consciousness) and freedom from all pain as such. For him, who actually experiences the Self in this manner, there is nothing left to be done**. The same is expressed in the scriptural passage "What use is progeny to us, to whom the Self only is but the (heavenly) world?" (Br.Up. 4.4.22), which indicates that for a man who knows the Self, nothing is left to be done. So says

the Smṛti also, thus – “One who is delighted in the Self, is satisfied with the Self and is content in the same, has nothing left for him to do” (Gita 3.17).

Section 207

References:

हेयज्ञेयाप्यपाक्यानि विज्ञेयान्यग्रयाणतः । तेषामन्यत्र
विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृतः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.90 (Karika)

Those which are to be abandoned (three states), realised, adopted (calmness. etc.) and made inaffective (attachment etc.) should be known first. **Of these, the three (states), except the thing to be realised (Brahman), are regarded as mere imaginations born of ignorance.**

लौकिकादीनां क्रमेण ज्ञेयत्वेन निर्देशादस्तित्वाशङ्का परमार्थतो मा भूदित्याह – हेयानि च लौकिकादीनि त्रीणि जागरितस्वप्नसुषुप्तानि आत्मन्यसत्त्वेन रज्ज्वां सर्पवद्धातव्यानीत्यर्थः । ज्ञेयमिह चतुष्कोटिवर्जितं परमार्थतत्त्वम् । आप्यानि आप्तव्यानि त्यक्तबाह्यैषणात्रयेण भिक्षुणा पाण्डित्यबाल्यमौनाख्यानि साधनानि । पाक्यानि रागद्वेषमोहादयो दोषाः कषायाख्यानि पक्तव्यानि । सर्वाण्येतानि हेयज्ञेयाप्यपाक्यानि विज्ञेयानि भिक्षुणा उपायत्वेनेत्यर्थः । अग्रयाणतः प्रथमतः । तेषां हेयादीनामन्यत्र विज्ञेयात्परमार्थसत्यं विज्ञेयं ब्रह्मैकं वर्जयित्वा । उपलम्भनमुपलम्भः अविद्याकल्पनामात्रम् ।

हेयाप्यपाक्येषु त्रिष्वपि स्मृतो ब्रह्मविद्भिः न परमार्थसत्यता त्रयाणामित्यर्थः

Ma.Up.Ka. 4.90 Bh.

Since the ordinary state etc. have been shown as objects to be known in succession, the doubt that they are really existent should not occur. Therefore, it is said: The notion of the three states viz the ordinary etc. and also waking, dream, and deep sleep in the Self should be abandoned, just as one abandons the false notion of a snake in a rope. The supreme Reality devoid of the four alternatives, is the thing to be known here (i.e. to be realised).

Those means that are to be adopted by the monk after giving up the *three kinds of external longing (eshanas), are erudition, strength (or power) and calmness.

(Similarly) those that are to be made ineffective are the evils such as attachment, repulsion, delusion etc. called passions. The meaning is that, first of all, all these that are to be abandoned, realised, adopted and made ineffective, should be known by the monk as means.

Among the things to be abandoned etc., apart from the one Brahman, the supreme Truth that is to be known, the rest are mere imaginations born of ignorance. **As for the three viz things to be abandoned, adopted, and made ineffective, they are not regarded to be true from the ultimate point of view, by the knowers of Brahman**. This is the view.

अमौनं च आत्मज्ञानानात्मप्रत्ययतिरस्कारौ पाण्डित्यबाल्यसंज्ञकौ निःशेषं कृत्वा, मौनं नाम अनात्मप्रत्ययतिरस्करणस्य पर्यवसानं फलम् – तच्च निर्विद्य अथ ब्राह्मणः कृतकृत्यो भवति – ब्रह्मैव सर्वमिति प्रत्यय उपजायते

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

After having known all about scholarship and strength, which respectively mean Self-knowledge and the elimination of ideas of the non-Self, he knows all about meditativeness too–which is the culminating result of the latter–and its opposite, and becomes a knower of Brahman, or accomplishes his task: **he attains the conviction that all is Brahman (brahmaiva sarvamiti pratyaya upajāyate).**

तस्मात् आन्तरो भावविशेषो बालस्य । अप्ररूढेन्द्रियत्वादिः इह बाल्यमाश्रीयते ।
तदाह - अनाविष्कुर्वन्निति । ज्ञानाध्ययन-धार्मिकत्वादिभिः आत्मानमविख्यापयन् । दम्भदर्पादि-रहितो भवेत् - यथा बालः अप्ररूढेन्द्रियतया न परेषाम् आत्मानमाविष्कर्तुमीहते, तद्वत्

BSBh. 3.4.50

Therefore only the special inward condition of a child, such as the absence of a functional ability in a child, is to be understood by the word 'Bālya' here. That is why the Sūtrakāra states (in the Sūtra) – "Not making himself manifest" etc., i.e., without proclaiming himself by

parading his knowledge, studies and religiosity (before others), and he should be free from hypocrisy and arrogance, just as a child that has not yet acquired his functional activity, has no desire to manifest itself to others.

शास्त्राचार्योपदेशेन ज्ञानोत्पत्तिहेतुं सहकारिकारणं बुद्धिविशुद्धत्वादि अमानित्वादिगुणं च अपेक्ष्य जनितस्य क्षेत्रज्ञपरमात्मैकत्वज्ञानस्य कर्तृत्वादिकारकभेदबुद्धिनिबन्धनसर्वकर्मसंन्याससहितस्य स्वात्मानुभवनिश्चयरूपेण यत् अवस्थानम् , सा परा ज्ञाननिष्ठा इति उच्यते ।

सा इयं ज्ञाननिष्ठा आर्तादिभक्तित्रयापेक्षया परा चतुर्थी भक्तिरिति उक्ता । तया परया भक्त्या भगवन्तं तत्त्वतः अभिजानाति, यदनन्तरमेव ईश्वरक्षेत्रज्ञभेदबुद्धिः अशेषतः निवर्तते । अतः ज्ञाननिष्ठालक्षणया भक्त्या माम् अभिजानातीति वचनं न विरुध्यते

BGh. 18.55

When the knowledge of the unity (identity) of the individual Self (Kshetrajna) and the Supreme Self (Paramatman), generated by the teachings of the scriptures and the master under conditions favorable to the rise and ripening of that knowledge viz., purity of mind, humility and other attributes and accompanied with the renunciation of all works which are associated with the idea of distinctions such as the agent and other

factors of action, culminates in a firm conviction by one's own experience, then the knowledge is said to have attained supreme consummation. **This jnananishtha (Devotion of Knowledge) is referred to as the Supreme or fourth kind of Devotion, Bhakti, supreme as compared with the remaining three kinds of Devotion, with that of the distressed, etc.**

By this supreme devotion the aspirant knows the Lord as He is, and immediately afterwards all consciousness of difference between the Isvara and the Kshetrajna disappears altogether. Thus, there is no contradiction involved in the statement that "by the Devotion of Knowledge (the aspirant knows) Me."

Section 208

References:

मुक्त्यवस्था हि सर्ववेदान्तेष्वेकरूपैव अवधार्यते । ब्रह्मैव हि मुक्त्यवस्था । न च ब्रह्मणोऽनेकाकार-योगोऽस्ति

BSBh. 3.4.52

All Vedānta texts understand this condition of liberation to be of one uniform nature. Brahman itself is this condition of liberation, and there is no possibility of Brahman ever being of many sorts, because according to the scriptural statements.

अपि च विद्या-साधनं स्ववीर्य-विशेषात् । स्वफल एव विद्यायां कञ्चिदतिशयम् आसञ्जयेत् । न विद्याफले मुक्तौ । तद्धि असाध्यं नित्यसिद्ध-स्वभावमेव
विद्यया अधिगम्यते इत्यसकृदवादिष्म । न च तस्याम् अप्युत्कर्षनिकर्षात्मकोऽतिशय उपपद्यते । निकृष्टाया विद्यात्वाभावात् । उत्कृष्टैव हि विद्या भवति । तस्मात् तस्यां चिराचिरोत्पत्ति-रूपोऽतिशयो भवन् भवेत् । न तु मुक्तौ कश्चित् अतिशय-सम्भवोऽस्ति
BSBh. 3.4.52

Besides, the means of knowledge, on account of their varying strength, may well create some such peculiarity in their own fruit i.e. 'knowledge', but never in the case of the fruit of knowledge i.e. liberation. **We have often said that it is not something, which has to be attained, because of its nature of always being ready and in existence** (nityasiddha-svabhāvameva) and being something, which is realized through knowledge. For the matter of that, even in the case of knowledge, that there is no such difference in it, as (for instance) its being good or bad, is reasonably sustainable. **Because were 'knowledge' to be inferior it would not be knowledge at all, because knowledge always is the most superior thing** (nikṛṣṭāyā vidyātvābhāvāt . utkṛṣṭaiva hi vidyā bhavati). Therefore, there may, at the most, if at all, be a difference in the length of time after which it is generated viz. immediately or after a long time. But no such difference is possible in the matter of liberation.

विद्याभेदाभावादपि तत्फलभेदनियमाभावः, कर्मफलवत् ; न हि मुक्तिसाधनभूताया विद्यायाः कर्मणामिव भेदोऽस्ति । सगुणासु तु विद्यासु 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरःऽ (छा। उ। ३ । १४ । २) इत्याद्यासु गुणावापोद्वापवशाद्भेदोपपत्तौ सत्याम् , उपपद्यते यथास्वं फलभेदनियमः, कर्मफलवत् – तथा च लिङ्गदर्शनम् – 'तं यथा यथोपासते तदेव भवतिऽ इति ; नैवं निर्गुणायां विद्यायाम् , गुणाभावात् ; तथा च स्मृतिः – 'न हि गतिरधिकास्ति कस्यचित्सति हि गुणे प्रवदन्त्यतुल्यताम्ऽ (म। भा। १२ । १९४ । ६०) इति

BSBh. 3.4.52

Besides in as much as there is absence of any such difference even in the case of knowledge, there is a similar absence of any rule, as to its fruit also as there is in the case of (unlike) fruits of religious actions. There is no difference in the case of knowledge, which is the means of liberation as there is in (unlike) the case of religious actions. In the case of Vidyās (Meditations) dealing with Qualified Brahman, as for instance – "It has mind as its structure, it has Prāṇa as its body" (Chan.Up. 3.14.2) etc. as the possibility of a difference due to an increase or decrease of Guṇas is reasonably sustainable, a rule as to the difference in the fruit is also reasonably sustainable. As it is, in the case of fruits of actions. The following is the scriptural indicatory mark about it – "According as they try to propitiate Him, they become". It is not so, however, in the case of Vidyās about Unqualified Brahman since there is no quality (to be

considered). Similar also is the Smṛti statement – “There is nothing such as a higher goal (in the case of a Vidyā of Unqualified Brahman). It is only when it is a Vidyā of Qualified Brahman, that differences are spoken of”.

यत्र हि निरस्तसर्वविशेषसम्बन्धं परं ब्रह्मात्मत्वेनोपदिश्यते, तत्रैकरूपमेव फलं मोक्ष इत्यवगम्यते । यत्र तु गुणविशेषसम्बन्धं प्रतीकविशेषसम्बन्धं वा ब्रह्मोपदिश्यते, तत्र संसारगोचराण्येवोच्चावचानि फलानि दृश्यन्ते - ‘अन्नादो वसुदानो विन्दते वसु य एवं वेद’ (ब्र्।उप्। ४।४।२४) इत्याद्यासु श्रुतिषु

BSBh. 1.1.24

Where the Highest Brahman devoid of all connection with any particular attributes is taught to be the Self of all, we understand (in that case) that there is a uniform fruit only, viz. liberation, but where Brahman, as connected with distinguishing attributes, or as connected with outward symbols, is taught, (in that case) higher or lower fruits as they are known in this transmigratory existence, are found to be mentioned, as for instance in the following scriptural passage – “He is the eater of all food’s and the giver of wealth; he who knows it to be so, obtains wealth” (Br.Up. 4.4.24).

Section 209

References:

यथा लोके द्रष्टुश्चक्षुष आलोकेन संयोगो यत्कालः, तत्काल एव रूपाभिव्यक्तिः, एवमात्मविषयं विज्ञानं यत्कालम् , तत्काल एव तद्विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावः स्यात् ; अतो ब्रह्मविद्यायां सत्याम् अविद्याकार्यानुपपत्तेः, प्रदीप इव तमःकार्यस्य, केन कस्य विघ्नं कुर्युर्देवाः यत्र आत्मत्वमेव देवानां ब्रह्मविदः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

As in the world a form is revealed as soon as the observer's eye is in touch with light, similarly the very moment that one has a knowledge of the Supreme Self, ignorance regarding It must disappear. Hence, the effects of ignorance being impossible in the presence of the knowledge of Brahman, like the effects of darkness in the presence of a lamp, whom should the gods thwart and by what means, for is not the knower of Brahman the self of the gods?

अज्ञाननिवर्तकत्वात् ज्ञानस्य ; अज्ञानव्यवधाननिवर्तकत्वात् ज्ञानस्य मोक्षो ज्ञानकार्यमित्युपचर्यते । न तु कर्मणा निवर्तयितव्यमज्ञानम् ; न च अज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण मोक्षस्य व्यवधानान्तरं कल्पयितुं शक्यम् – नित्यत्वान्मोक्षस्य साधकस्वरूपाव्यतिरेकाच्च – यत्कर्मणा निवर्त्येत

Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.

for knowledge dispels ignorance. Because knowledge removes the obstruction of ignorance, liberation is metaphorically said to be the effect of knowledge (jñānakāryamityupacaryate); but work cannot dispel ignorance. And we cannot imagine any other obstruction to liberation but ignorance that can be removed by work, for it is eternal and identical with the self of the aspirant.

Section 210

References:

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः । क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे

Mund.Up. 2.2.8 (sruti)

When that Self, which is both the high and the low, is realized, the knot of the heart gets united, all doubts become solved, and all one's actions become dissolute.

अस्य परमात्मज्ञानस्य फलमिदमभिधीयते – हृदयग्रन्थिः अविद्यावासनामयो बुद्ध्याश्रयः कामः, 'कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः' (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । ७), (का। उ। २ । ३ । १४) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् । हृदयाश्रयोऽसौ, नात्माश्रयः । भिद्यते भेदं विनाशमुपयाति । छिद्यन्ते सर्वे ज्ञेयविषयाः संशयाः लौकिकानाम् आ मरणात् गङ्गास्रोतोवत्प्रवृत्ता विच्छेदमायान्ति । अस्य विच्छिन्नसंशयस्य निवृत्ताविद्यस्य यानि विज्ञानोत्पत्तेः प्राक्कृतानि जन्मान्तरे चाप्रवृत्तफलानि

ज्ञानोत्पत्तिसहभावीनि च क्षीयन्ते कर्माणि, न त्वेतज्जन्मारम्भकाणि, प्रवृत्तफलत्वात् । तस्मिन् सर्वज्ञेऽसंसारिणि परावरे परं च कारणात्मना अवरं च कार्यात्मना तस्मिन्परावरे साक्षादहमस्मीति दृष्टे, संसारकारणोच्छेदान्मुच्यत इत्यर्थः

Mund.Up. 2.2.8 Bh.

The result of this knowledge of this supreme Self is being stated: The knot of the heart is cut asunder: knot is desire in the form of the aggregate of tendencies that remain in the intellect, as declared by another sruti-passage, "When all desires that are in the heart (vanish)" (Kath.Up. 2.3.14 and Br.Up. 4.4.7). It is dependent on the heart, but not on the Self. Cut asunder (bhidyate): comes to destruction. All doubts regarding all knowable objects that continue to exist in common people till their death, like the current of the Ganga, come to a cessation. The karmas of one which were performed in the previous lives before the dawn of realisation, which have not borne fruits and which were performed simultaneously with the realisation, perish, in the case of one whose doubts have vanished and who is free from ignorance, but not the karmas which served as the cause for the present life, since they have begun to produce their effects. The meaning is that he who perceives the omnipotent One who is free from samsara, who is both high (para) in its capacity as 'the cause'; and low (avara) in its capacity as 'the effect' and realises It as **'I truly am this', becomes**

liberated due to the destruction of the cause of samsara.

Section 211

References:

न च विद्याविद्ये एकस्य पुरुषस्य सह भवतः, विरोधात् –

तमःप्रकाशाविव । तस्मात् आत्मविदः अविद्याविषयोऽधिकारो न द्रष्टव्यः क्रियाकारकफलभेदरूपः

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

Knowledge and ignorance cannot coexist in the same individual, for they are contradictory like light and darkness. Therefore **the knower of the Self must not be supposed to have relations with the sphere of ignorance consisting of actions, their factors and their results**.

किञ्च न च विपरीतप्रत्ययो विद्यावत उत्पद्यते, निर्विषयत्वात् – अनवधृतविषयविशेषस्वरूपं हि सामान्यमात्रमाश्रित्य विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यमान उत्पद्यते, यथा शुक्तिकायां रजतमिति ; स च विषयविशेषावधारणवतो अशेषविपरीतप्रत्ययाशयस्योपमर्दितत्वात् न पूर्ववत्सम्भवति, शुक्तिकादौ सम्यक्प्रत्ययोत्पत्तौ पुनरदर्शनात्

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Moreover, **false notions do not arise in a man of realisation, for there is then no object for them. Whenever a false notion arises, it does so on account of a certain similarity of something to another, without ascertaining the particular nature of that thing, as when a mother of pearl is mistaken for a piece of silver**. And this can nor more happen to one who has ascertained the particular nature of that thing, for the source of all false notions (that cursory resemblance) has been destroyed; as they no more appear when a right perception of the motherofpearl, for instance, has taken place.

नावगतब्रह्मात्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम् ।
वेदप्रमाणजनित-ब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्
BSBh. 1.1.4
It is not possible to show that he who has once understood the condition of the Self's unity (identity) with Brahman, still continues to be affected by the transmigratory condition, because it is contradictory to the condition of the unity (identity) of the Self with Brahman achieved on scriptural authority.

गुणान् एतान् यथोक्तान् अतीत्य जीवन्नेव अतिक्रम्य मायोपाधिभूतान् त्रीन् देही देहसमुद्भवान् देहोत्पत्तिबीजभूतान् जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखैः जन्म च मृत्युश्च जरा च दुःखानि च जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखानि तैः जीवन्नेव

विमुक्तः सन् विद्वान् अमृतम् अश्नुते, एवं मद्भावम् अधिगच्छति इत्यर्थः

BGh. 14.20

The wise man (Jnani) having crossed over while living itself the modes (gunas) aforesaid which are conditioned by Maya and which are the seeds from which the body emerges, is liberated from birth, death, decay and pains while still alive, and enjoys immortality, i.e., he thus attains to My being.

Section 212

References:

इतरस्यापि पुण्यस्य कर्मणः एवम् अघवत् असंश्लेषो विनाशश्च ज्ञानवतो भवतः -

BSBh. 4.1.14

that in the case of a **man who has attained knowledge, there is a similar non-contact and destruction of acts of the other kind i.e., meritorious acts, as in the case of sinful acts.**

अकर्त्रात्मत्वबोध-निमित्तस्य च कर्मक्षयस्य सुकृतदुष्कृतयोः तुल्यत्वात्

BSBh. 4.1.14

As is indicated by (the use of) the word 'destruction', because the destruction of actions, as a result of the

knowledge that the Self is never an agent (i.e. the doer of such acts), is common, both to meritorious as well as sinful acts.

अप्रवृत्तफले एव पूर्वे जन्मान्तर-सञ्चिते । अस्मिन्नपि च जन्मनि प्राग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः सञ्चिते, सुकृत-दुष्कृते । ज्ञानाधिगमात् क्षीयेते । न तु आरब्धकार्ये सामिभुक्तफले । याभ्यामेतत् ब्रह्मज्ञानायतनं जन्म निर्मितम् । कुत एतत्?
'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ सम्पत्स्ये' (छन्।उप्। ६।१४।२) इति शरीरपातावधिकरणात् क्षेमप्राप्तेः

BSBh. 4.1.15

It is the collective meritorious and unmeritorious actions of the previous birth, and those also of the present birth done prior to the generation of knowledge of Brahman and which have not yet started to fructify, that are annihilated by such acquisition of the knowledge of Brahman, but not those which have already started to fructify and which are only semi-enjoyed, and which have constituted the cause of the generation of the present body (i.e. Janma) which is the repository of the knowledge of Brahman. Whence is it so? **Because the scriptures have prescribed the fall of the body as the point of time at which liberation takes place** by the passage "He is delayed in the acquisition of liberation, only so long as he is not relieved of the body" (Chan.Up. 6.14.2)

यन्नित्यं कर्म वैदिकमग्निहोत्रादि । तत् तत्कार्यायैव भवति । ज्ञानस्य यत्कार्यं तदेव अस्यापि कार्यमित्यर्थः

BSBh. 4.1.16

Whatever is routine (Nitya) Vedic religious action, such as Agni-hotra etc. for instance makes for precisely the same result. The meaning is that the result of such action is the same as the result of knowledge.

न हि साक्षादेव ज्ञानाग्निः कर्माणि इन्धनवत् भस्मीकर्तुं शक्नोति । तस्मात् सम्यग्दर्शनं सर्वकर्मणां निर्बीजत्वे कारणम् इत्यभिप्रायः । सामर्थ्यात् येन कर्मणा शरीरम् आरब्धं तत् प्रवृत्तफलत्वात् उपभोगेनैव क्षीयते ।
अतो यानि अप्रवृत्तफलानि ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः प्राक् कृतानि ज्ञानसहभावीनि च अतीतानेकजन्मकृतानि च तान्येव सर्वाणि भस्मसात् कुरुते

BGh. 4.37

The fire of wisdom cannot indeed literally reduce actions to ashes as fire reduces fuel to ashes. Accordingly, we should understand that right knowledge is the cause which renders all actions impotent. Since action, which is the cause for the body to come into being, is steadily producing its result now, it will come to an end only when its result has been fully reaped. Therefore, the actions done prior to the dawn of knowledge in the many previous births or of those done along with knowledge, that alone which remains yet to produce the result, is destroyed by knowledge.

न तावदनाश्रित्य आरब्धकार्यं कर्माशयं ज्ञानोत्पत्तिरुपपद्यते । आश्रिते च तस्मिन्कुलालचक्रवत् प्रवृत्तवेगस्य अन्तराले प्रतिबन्धासम्भवात् । भवति वेगक्षयप्रतिपालनम् । अकर्त्रात्म-बोधोऽपि हि मिथ्याज्ञान-बाधनेन कर्माण्युच्छिनत्ति । बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कंचित्कालम् अनुवर्तत एव । अपि च नैवात्र विवदितव्यम् - ब्रह्मविदा कञ्चित्कालं शरीरं धियते न वा धियत इति । कथं हि एकस्य स्वहृदय-प्रत्ययं ब्रह्म-वेदनं देह-धारणं च अपरेण प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्येत ?

BSBh. 4.1.15

It is not reasonably sustainable, that there can be any generation of the knowledge of Brahman without the acceptance of a reservoir of actions (which is the cause of the generation of a body), in which actions have started their effects i.e. fructification, and when once that is accepted, and when, as in the case of a potter's wheel which has been set in motion, there is no possibility of any hindrance to the momentum which is generated, it is inevitable that such knowledge has to await the dissipation of that momentum. The knowledge that the Self (Ātmā) is not an agent also annihilates actions by removing wrong knowledge but even though it is so removed it does still persist for a while, as a result of past impressions, just as, for instance, the notion about there being two moons also persists for some time. Besides, **it should not be discussed here (i.e. it is not debatable here) as to whether a man who has realized**

Brahman does continue to possess a body for some time after such realization, or whether he does not because how can one man ever dispute another man's experience of both the realization of Brahman and of his yet continuing to possess a body, as such experience of the other man, can belong to such other man alone?

तस्माद् अनारब्धकार्ययोरेव सुकृतदुष्कृतयोः विद्या-सामर्थ्यात् क्षय इति निर्णयः

BSBh. 4.1.15

Therefore the final conclusion is, that through the power of knowledge there is annihilation only of the meritorious and unmeritorious actions which have not yet started their effects i.e. fructification.

क्वचित्तु विद्यायाः पूर्वोत्पन्नविपरीतप्रत्ययजनितसंस्कारेभ्यो विपरीतप्रत्ययावभासाः स्मृतयो जायमाना विपरीतप्रत्ययभ्रान्तिम् अकस्मात् कुर्वन्ति – यथा
विज्ञातदिग्विभागस्याप्यकस्माद्दिग्विपर्ययविभ्रमः

Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.

Sometimes, however, memories due to the impressions of false notions, antecedent to the dawning of knowledge, simulating those notions, suddenly appear and throw him into the error regarding them as actual false notions as one who is familiar with the points of the compass sometimes all of a sudden gets confused about them.

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्व-विपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्व-स्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीम्, नापि भविष्यत्काले - इति ब्रह्मविद् अवगच्छति । एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते

BSBh. 4.1.13

The person who has realized Brahman understands, that he himself is Brahman, which has the nature of never being an agent or an experiencer during all the three divisions of time (viz. the past, present or future). Contrary to the preconceived (wrong) notion of being such an agent or experiencer, and a person who has realized Brahman knows that he never was such agent or experiencer before, nor is he so at present, nor will he ever be so at some future time. Liberation is reasonably sustainable only in this way.

न हि सद्योमुक्तिभाजां सम्यग्दर्शननिष्ठानां गतिः आगतिर्वा क्वचित् अस्ति, 'न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्तिऽ (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । ६) इति श्रुतेः

BGh. 8.24

There is nothing like 'going' or 'standing still' for those who attain to instant liberation (sadyomukti) and who are estalbished in the right perception (understanding), for there is the sruti, 'His pranas do not go up (or out) (Br.Up. 4.4.6)'.

Section 213

References:

जन्मादिसर्वविक्रियारहितत्वेन निष्क्रियम् आत्मानम् आत्मत्वेन यो वेत्ति तस्य आत्मविदः सम्यग्दर्शनेन अपास्तमिथ्याज्ञानस्य निष्क्रियात्मस्वरूपावस्थानलक्षणं सर्वकर्मसंन्यासम् उक्त्वा तद्विपरीतस्य मिथ्याज्ञानमूलकर्तृत्वाभिमानपुरःसरस्य सक्रियात्मस्वरूपावस्थानरूपस्य कर्मयोगस्य इह गीताशास्त्रे तत्र तत्र आत्मस्वरूपनिरूपणप्रदेशेषु सम्यग्ज्ञानमिथ्याज्ञानतत्कार्यविरोधात् अभावः प्रतिपाद्यते यस्मात् , तस्मात् आत्मविदः निवृत्तमिथ्याज्ञानस्य विपर्ययज्ञानमूलः कर्मयोगो न सम्भवतीति युक्तम् उक्तं स्यात्

BGh. 5. Upod Bh.

Here in the Gita-Sastra, while critically examining the real nature of the Self, renunciation of all actions leading to the state of constant dwelling in the actionless Self has been enjoined on him who knows the Self in his own Self, devoid of all changes such as birth etc. and actionless and who has overcome erroneous knowledge by right understanding. Besides it has also been explained that inasmuch as right knowledge and erroneous knowledge as well as their efforts are mutually opposed, the knower of the Self is unconcerned with karma-yoga which is the opposilte of karma-sannyasa and which originates from erroneous knowledge, necessitating

a Self that is ever active (and not actionless) as well as the feeling that one is the doer. Therefore, it is logical to have said that for the one who has realised the Self and who is set free from wrong knowledge, karma-yoga, born of incorrect knowledge, is impossible.

तस्मात् अनात्मवित्कर्तृकयोरेव संन्यासकर्मयोगयोः
निःश्रेयसकरत्ववचनम् , तदीयाच्च कर्मसंन्यासात्
पूर्वोक्तात्मवित्कर्तृकसर्वकर्मसंन्यासविलक्षणात् सत्येव कर्तृत्वविज्ञाने
कर्मैकदेशविषयात् यमनियमादिसहितत्वेन च दुरनुष्ठेयात् सुकरत्वेन च
कर्मयोगस्य विशिष्टत्वाभिधानम्

BGh. 5. Upod Bh.

Therefore, the injunction that karma-sannyasa and karmayoga are means to moksha relates to him who is not a knower of the Self. The renunciation of all actions of the knower of the Self already spoken of is different from the renunciation of only a few actions herein spoken, with the attitude, 'I am doing'. The renunciation of the former is difficult to follow as it is based on yama, niyama etc. Therefore, the later (karma-yoga), being easier to follow, is spoken of as better of the two.

यस्तु प्रारब्धकर्मा सन् उत्तरकालमुत्पन्नात्मसम्यग्दर्शनः स्यात् , सः
सर्वकर्मणि प्रयोजनमपश्यन् ससाधनं कर्म परित्यजत्येव । सः कुतश्चित्

निमित्तात् कर्मपरित्यागासम्भवे सति कर्मणि तत्फले च सङ्गरहिततया स्वप्रयोजनाभावात् लोकसङ्ग्रहार्थं पूर्ववत् कर्मणि प्रवृत्तोऽपि नैव किञ्चित् करोति । ज्ञानाग्निदग्धकर्मत्वात् तदीयं कर्म अकर्मैव सम्पद्यते

BGh. 4.19

He again who, having been engaged in actions under the influence of past tendencies, later on becomes endowed with the fullest Self-knowledge, he surely renounces (all) actions along with their accessories as he does not find any purpose in activity. **For some reason, if it becomes impossible to renounce actions and he, for the sake of preventing people from going astray, even remains engaged as before in actions – without attachment to those actions and their results because of the absence of any selfish purpose, still he does nothing at all**! Since all his actions are burnt clean in the fire of wisdom, his action becomes equal to inaction.

यदि वस्तुभूताः गुणाः, यदि वा अविद्याकल्पिताः, तद्धर्मः कर्म, तदा आत्मनि अविद्याध्यारोपितमेव इति अविद्वान् 'न हि कश्चित् क्षणमपि अशेषतः त्यक्तुं शक्नोतिऽ (भ। गी। ३ । ५) इति उक्तम् । विद्वांस्तु पुनः विद्यया अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां शक्नोत्येव अशेषतः कर्म परित्यक्तुम् , अविद्याध्यारोपितस्य शेषानुपपत्तेः । न हि तैमिरिकदृष्ट्या अध्यारोपितस्य द्विचन्द्रादेः तिमिरापगमेऽपि शेषः अवतिष्ठते

BGh. 18.48

Action is the property or attribute of the gunas, be they regarded as real things, or as things set up by avidya (ignorance). It is ascribed to the Self through avidya (ignorance), and it has therefore been said that no ignorant man (avidvan) can renounce action entirely even for a moment (Gita 3.5). On the other hand, he who **knows the Self is able to renounce action entirely, inasmuch as avidya (ignorance) has been expelled by vidya (self-knowledge); for, there can be no residue left of what is ascribed by avidya (ignorance).**
Never indeed will anything be left of the second moon seen by the eyes affected by Timira (cataract), when Timira (cataract) has vanished.

यत्तु साङ्ख्यैः कर्मत्यागोऽभ्युपगम्यते, क्रियाकारकफलभेदबुद्धेः सत्यत्वाभ्युपगमात् , तन्मृषा । यच्च बौद्धैः शून्यताभ्युपगमात् अकर्तृत्वमभ्युपगम्यते, तदप्यसत् , तदभ्युपगन्तुः सत्त्वाभ्युपगमात् । यच्च अज्ञैरलसतया अकर्तृत्वाभ्युपगमः, सोऽप्यसत् , कारकबुद्धेरनिवर्तितत्वात्प्रमाणेन ।
तस्मात् वेदान्तप्रमाणजनितैकत्वप्रत्ययवत एव कर्मनिवृत्तिलक्षणं पारिव्राज्यं ब्रह्मसंस्थत्वं चेति सिद्धम् । एतेन गृहस्थस्यैकत्वविज्ञाने सति पारिव्राज्यमर्थसिद्धम्

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

As for the renunciation of rites and duties, admitted by the Sankhyas, that is wrong since they accept the idea of differences of actions, accessories, and results, as true.

And as for the admission of non-agentship by the Bauddhas as a result of their accepting non-existence of everything, that also is wrong because such a position will be tantamount to their acceptance of the existence of the person making the assertion of non-agentship. As for the recourse to inactivity taken by the ignorant people, owing to their indolence, that too is wrong because their idea of agentship has not been eliminated by correct knowledge. Therefore, it is proved that monasticism remaining established in Brahman, as characterised by ceasing to perform rites and duties, is only for the man who has the realisation of unity (identity), originating from the **Upanisads WHICH ARE THE VALID MEANS OF KNOWLEDGE. Hereby it follows by implication that, when a householder realises unity (identity),** he has to resort to monasticism as a matter of course.

Section 214

References:

गर्भस्थ एव च वामदेवः प्रतिपेदे ब्रह्मभावमिति वदन्ती । जन्मान्तर-सञ्चितात् साधनात् जन्मान्तरे विद्योत्पत्तिं दर्शयति । न हि गर्भस्थस्यैव ऐहिकं किञ्चित्साधनं सम्भाव्यते

BSBh. 3.4.51

The Scriptures, which declare that **Vāmadeva attained Brahma-hood even while he was in the embryonic stage, show that through means accumulated in the previous life, knowledge is attained during the next birth**. For it is not possible for a foetus in the mother's womb to resort to any means normally undertaken in this world.

यथा पुण्यकर्मोद्भवैर्विविक्तैः कार्यकरणैः संयुक्ते जन्मनि सति प्रज्ञामेधास्मृतिवैशारद्यं दृष्टम् , तथा प्रजापतेर्धर्मज्ञानवैराग्यैश्वर्यविपरीतहेतुसर्वपाप्मदाहाद्विशुद्धैः कार्यकरणैः संयुक्तमुत्कृष्टं जन्म ; तदुद्भवं चानुपदिष्टमेव युक्तमेकत्वदर्शनं प्रजापतेः । तथा च स्मृतिः – 'ज्ञानमप्रतिघं यस्य वैराग्यं च प्रजापतेः ऐश्वर्यं चैव धर्मश्च सहसिद्धं चतुष्टयम्ऽ इति

Br.Up. 1.4.2 Bh.

That is to say, as we see that when a person has been born with a select body and organs as a result of his past merits, he excels in knowledge, intelligence and memory, similarly Prajapati, having burnt all his evils which produce qualities the very opposite of righteousness, knowledge, dispassion and lordship, had a perfected birth in which he was possessed of a pure body and organs; hence he might well have the knowledge of unity even without any instruction. As the Smṛti says, 'The Lord of the universe is born with these

four virtues–infallible knowledge, dispassion, lordship and righteousness'.

यस्यैव पुरुषस्य उपमर्दितः प्रत्ययः ब्रह्मक्षत्राद्यात्मविषयः, तस्य तत्प्रत्ययसन्न्यासात् तत्कार्याणां कर्मणां कर्मसाधनानां च अर्थप्राप्तश्च सन्न्यासः । तस्मात् आत्मज्ञानाङ्गत्वेन सन्न्यासविधित्सयैव आख्यायिकेयमारभ्यते

Br.Up. 2.4.1 Bh.

When a man's notion that he is a Brahmana, a Kshatriya or the like becomes eradicated, there automatically comes the renunciation of the rites and their accessories which are the effects of the above notion as a result of the annihilation stated above. Therefore, this narrative is begun enjoining Sannyasa (renunciation) as a part of the knowledge of the Self.

व्युत्थानं तर्ह्यर्थप्राप्तत्वान्न चोदनार्थ इति । गार्हस्थ्ये चेत्परं ब्रह्मविज्ञानं जातम् , तत्रैवास्त्वकुर्वत आसनं न ततोऽन्यत्र गमनमिति चेत् ।

न ; कामप्रयुक्तत्वाद्गार्हस्थ्यस्य । 'एतावान्वै कामः' (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १७) 'उभे ह्येते एषणे एव' (बृ। उ। ३ । ५ । १)(बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २२) इत्यवधारणात् कामनिमित्तपुत्रवित्तादिसम्बन्धनियमाभावमात्रम् ; न हि ततोऽन्यत्र गमनं व्युत्थानमुच्यते । अतो न गार्हस्थ्य एवाकुर्वत आसनमुत्पन्नविद्यस्य । एतेन गुरुशुश्रूषातपसोरप्यप्रतिपत्तिर्विदुषः सिद्धा । अत्र केचिद्गृहस्था भिक्षाटनादिभयात्परिभवाच्च त्रस्यमानाः सूक्ष्मदृष्टितां दर्शयन्त उत्तरमाहुः । भिक्षोरपि

भिक्षाटनादिनियमदर्शनाद्देहधारणमात्रार्थिनो गृहस्थस्यापि
साध्यसाधनैषणोभयविनिर्मुक्तस्य
देहमात्रधारणार्थमशनाच्छादनमात्रमुपजीवतो गृह एवास्त्वासनमिति । न,
स्वगृहविशेषपरिग्रहनियमस्य कामप्रयुक्तत्वादित्युक्तोत्तरमेतत् ।
स्वगृहविशेषपरिग्रहाभावे च शरीरधारणमात्रप्रयुक्ताशनाच्छादनार्थिनः
स्वपरिग्रहविशेषभावेऽर्थाद्भिक्षुकत्वमेव

Ait.Up. Upod Bh.

Objection: Then it comes to this that renunciation follows as a matter of course and is not fit to be enjoined. Therefore, if the supreme knowledge of Brahman dawns in domestic life, the inactive [One who does not engage anymore in scriptural rituals etc.] man may continue in that state, and there need be no moving away from it.

Answer: No, since domestic life is induced by desire, for it has been clearly declared, `This much indeed is desire' (Br.Up. 1.4.17), `Both these [Hankering for ends and means.] are indeed desires' (Br.Up. 3.5.1, Br.Up. 4.4.22). **Renunciation is defined as the mere absence of well-established relationship with sons etc. arising from desire, and not as the mere moving away from that domestic life.** And so, the inactive man of realization cannot continue in the domestic life itself. [He cannot consider himself a householder, nor can he deliberately put on the householder's garb or accept the latter's duties.]

Hereby it is established that for an illumined soul there can be no acceptance of such duties as the service of the Guru, or (practice of) austerities.

Against this argument, some householders, shy of begging alms and afraid of ridicule, advance the following rejoinder, thereby making a show of their intellectual insight: Inasmuch as a mendicant, desirous merely of maintaining his body, is seen to subject himself to regulations about begging, there can be continuance in the domestic life even for that householder who has become freed from both kinds of desires with regard to ends and means, but who has to depend on mere food and raiment for the maintenance of the body.

Answer: Not so, for this has already been refuted by saying that the constant habit of resorting to any particular house of one's own is prompted by desire. When there is no clinging to any particular house of one's own, there follows begging alone, as a matter of course, in the case of one who has no special inclination for turning to his own and who seeks for food and clothing under the mere impulsion of maintaining the body.

एवं तर्हि सर्वः स्वाश्रमस्थः उत्पन्नैकत्वप्रत्ययः परिव्राडिति चेत् । न, स्वस्वामित्वभेदबुद्ध्यनिवृत्तेः, कर्मार्थत्वाच्च इतराश्रमाणाम् – 'अथ कर्म कुर्वीय' (बृ। उ। १ । ४ । १७) इति श्रुतेः

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

Opponent: If it be so, then, all those in whom has arisen the idea of Unity, even when continuing in their own stages of life, will be considered as monks.

Vedantin: No. Because, in their case, the ideas of differences like 'me' and 'mine' have not been eradicated. Moreover, the other stages of life are meant for rites and duties, in accordance with the Vedic text, '(Let me have wealth so that) I may perform rites' (Br.Up. 1.4.17).

यथाकामित्वं तु विदुषोऽत्यन्तमप्राप्तम् , अत्यन्तमूढविषयत्वेनावगमात् । तथा शास्त्रचोदितमपि कर्मात्मविदोऽप्राप्तं गुरुभारतयावगम्यते ; किमुत अत्यन्ताविवेकनिमित्तं यथाकामित्वम् ? न हयुन्मादतिमिरदृष्ट्युपलब्धं वस्तु तदपगमेऽपि तथैव स्यात् , उन्मादतिमिरदृष्टिनिमित्तत्वादेव तस्य

Ait.Up.Upod Bh.

As for unchecked behaviour in the case of the illumined soul, it is entirely out of place, it being found among the extremely ignorant. Moreover, seeing that even scriptural duties are known to be inapplicable in the case of the knower of the Self, they being too burdensome, can he have unrestrained behaviour that arises from extreme nondiscrimination?

Not that a thing perceived under lunacy or through eyes affected by the Timira disease, continues to be exactly so when the disease is cured, that vision being contingent on lunacy or Timira.

न, बुभुक्षादिना एकत्वप्रत्ययात्प्रच्यावितस्योपपत्तेः, निवृत्त्यर्थत्वात् । न च प्रतिषिद्धसेवाप्राप्तिः, एकत्वप्रत्ययोत्पत्तेः प्रागेव प्रतिषिद्धत्वात्

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

Vedantin: No, because these rules (yama etc.) are meant for restraining a person who may become distracted from his conviction of Unity, by hunger etc. Besides, performance of prohibited action cannot take place (in his case) because such action had been prohibited even before the origination of the idea of Unity (identity).

यो हि यस्माद् विरक्तः स्यान् नासौ तस्मै प्रवर्तते ।
लोकत्रयाद् विरक्त्वान् मुम्क्षुः किमितीहते ॥
क्षुधया पिड्यमानोऽपि न विषं हयत्तुमिच्छति ।
मिष्टान्नध्वस्ततृड् जानन् नामूढस्तज् जिघत्सति ॥

UPS Metrical 18.228-229

Certainly, nobody strives towards something in which he has no interest. Why should a seeker of liberation make any effort since he has no interest in the three worlds? Even if suffering from hunger, one certainly does not want to take poison. Nobody whose hunger has been appeased by

sweet food knowingly wants to take poison unless he is a fool.

तस्माद्गीताशास्त्रे ईषन्मात्रेणापि श्रौतेन स्मार्तेन वा कर्मणा आत्मज्ञानस्य समुच्चयो न केनचिद्दर्शयितुं शक्यः । यस्य तु अज्ञानात् रागादिदोषतो वा कर्मणि प्रवृत्तस्य यज्ञेन दानेन तपसा वा विशुद्धसत्त्वस्य ज्ञानमुत्पन्नम्परमार्थतत्त्वविषयम् 'एकमेवेदं सर्वं ब्रह्म अकर्तृ च' इति, तस्य कर्मणि कर्मप्रयोजने च निवृत्तेऽपि लोकसङ्ग्रहार्थं यत्नपूर्वं यथा प्रवृत्तिः । तथैव प्रवृत्तस्य यत्प्रवृत्तिरूपं दृश्यते न तत्कर्म येन बुद्धेः समुच्चयः स्यात् ; यथा भगवतो वासुदेवस्य क्षत्रधर्मचेष्टितं न ज्ञानेन समुच्चीयते पुरुषार्थसिद्धये, तद्वत् तत्फलाभिसन्ध्यहङ्काराभावस्य तुल्यत्वाद्विदुषः । तत्त्वविन्नाहं करोमीति मन्यते, न च तत्फलमभिसन्धत्ते ।
यथा च स्वर्गादिकामार्थिनः अग्निहोत्रादिकर्मलक्षणधर्मानुष्ठानाय आहिताग्नेः काम्ये एव अग्निहोत्रादौ प्रवृत्तस्य सामि कृते विनष्टेऽपि कामे तदेव अग्निहोत्राद्यनुतिष्ठतोऽपि न तत्काम्यमग्निहोत्रादि भवति
BGh. 2.10

It is not, therefore, possible for anybody to show that the Gitasastra teaches a conjunction of knowledge with any work whatever, enjoined in the sruti or in the smriti. Some cases of apparent conjunction explained. **Now a person who, having been first engaged in works owing to ignorance and worldly attachment and other evil tendencies, and having since attained purity of mind by sacrificial rites, gifts, austerity, etc., arrives at the knowledge of the grand truth that "all this is one,**

the Brahman, the Absolute, the nonagent," may continue performing works in the same manner as before with a view to set an example to the masses, though neither works nor their results attract him any longer. This semblance of active life on his part cannot constitute that course of action with which knowledge is sought to be conjoined as a means of attaining moksha, any more than Lord Vasudeva's activity in His discharge of the duty of the military caste can constitute the action that is to be conjoined with His knowledge as a means to moksha, or that conduces to the attainment of any specific end of His; egotism and hope of reward being absent in both alike. **He who knows the truth does not think 'I act,' nor does he long for the results.** Or to take another example: suppose a man seeking svarga or other such objects of desire goes through the ceremony of the Agniadhana as a preliminary to the performance of sacrificial rites such as the Agnihotra whereby to attain his desire, and then commences the Agnihotra, which has thus became a kamya (interested) rite; and suppose further that the desire vanishes when the sacrifice is half completed, but that the man goes on with it all the same: the Agnihotra can no longer be regarded as an interested rite.

नैव किञ्चित् करोमीति युक्तः समाहितः सन् मन्येत चिन्तयेत् , तत्त्ववित् आत्मनो याथात्म्यं तत्त्वं वेत्तीति तत्त्ववित् परमार्थदर्शीत्यर्थः ॥ कदा कथं वा तत्त्वमवधारयन् मन्येत इति, उच्यते – पश्यन्निति । मन्येत इति पूर्वेण सम्बन्धः । यस्य एवं तत्त्वविदः सर्वकार्यकरणचेष्टासु कर्मसु अकर्मैव, पश्यतः सम्यग्दर्शिनः तस्य सर्वकर्मसंन्यासे एव अधिकारः, कर्मणः अभावदर्शनात् । न हि मृगतृष्णिकायाम् उदकबुद्ध्या पानाय प्रवृत्तः उदकाभावज्ञानेऽपि तत्रैव पानप्रयोजनाय प्रवर्तते

BGh. 5.8-9

'I work not at all' let the integrated sage, the knower of Truth, of the reality of the Self, i.e., the percipient of ultimate Reality, think so. When and in what way knowing the truth, shall he think so? Listen: when he sees etc., let him think thus construe the words. The knower of truth who sees only non-work (non-action) in all works of the psychophysical organism, i.e., the right seer, is alone fit to renounce all works; for he sees the negation of works. **None indeed striving to drink the water in the mirage will continue to do so even after grasping the absence of water there.**

Section 215

References:

परिव्राजकानां भिक्षाचरणादिवत् उत्पन्नैकत्वप्रत्ययानामपि गृहस्थादीनामग्निहोत्रादिकर्मानिवृत्तिरिति चेत् । न, प्रामाण्यचिन्तायां पुरुषप्रवृत्तेरदृष्टान्तत्वात् – न हि, नाभिचरेदिति प्रतिषिद्धमप्यभिचरणं कश्चित्कुर्वन्दृष्ट इति, शत्रौ द्वेषरहितेनापि विवेकिना अभिचरणं क्रियते । न च कर्मविधिप्रवृत्तिनिमित्ते भेदप्रत्यये बाधिते अग्निहोत्रादौ प्रवर्तकं निमित्तमस्ति, परिव्राजकस्येव भिक्षाचरणादौ बुभुक्षादि प्रवर्तकम्

Chand.Up. 2.23.1 Bh.

Opponent: Just like (such actions as) moving about for alms by the monks, there will be no withdrawal from such rites as Agnihotra etc. by the householders and others, even after they have the idea of Unity (identity).

Vedantin: No, because, when considering the validity (of injunctions), an instinctive action of a person cannot be cited as an illustration. From the fact that someone is seen to undertake blackmagic although it is prohibited, it does not follow that blackmagic is undertaken against an enemy even by a person of discrimination, who has no animosity. Moreover, when the conviction of duality, which is the cause for engaging in rites according to injunction, is eliminated, there cannot exist any cause for impelling one to perform Agnihotra etc. like hunger which impels a monk to beg.

न हि देशकालाद्यनवच्छिन्नास्थूलाद्वयादिब्रह्मप्रत्ययधारिणः कर्मावसरोऽस्ति । भोजनादिप्रवृत्त्यवसरवत्स्यादिति चेत् । न ; अविद्यादिकेवलदोषनिमित्तत्वाद्भोजनादिप्रवृत्तेरावश्यकत्वानुपपत्तेः । न

तु, तथा अनियतं कदाचित्क्रियते कदाचिन्न क्रियते चेति, नित्यं कर्मोपपद्यते । केवलदोषनिमित्तत्वात्तु भोजनादिकर्मणोऽनियतत्वं स्यात् , दोषोद्भवाभिभवयोरनियतत्वात् , कामानामिव काम्येषु । शास्त्रनिमित्तकालाद्यपेक्षत्वाच्च नित्यानामनियतत्वानुपपत्तिः ; दोषनिमित्तत्वे सत्यपि, यथा काम्याग्निहोत्रस्य शास्त्रविहितत्वात्सायम्प्रातःकालाद्यपेक्षत्वम्

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

One who thinks that he is Brahman unlimited by space, time, etc., and not gross and so on, has certainly no room for the performance of rites.

Objection: He may, as he has for the inclination to eat and so on.

Reply: No, **for the inclination to eat and so on is solely due to the defects of ignorance** etc. and are not supposed to be compulsory. But the regular rites cannot be uncertain like that; they cannot be sometimes done and sometimes omitted (according to one's whim). Acts like eating, however, may be irregular, as they are solely due to one’s defects, and these have no fixed time for appearing or disappearing, like desires for rites with material ends. But the regular rites, although they are due to defects, cannot be uncertain, for they depend on specific times etc. prescribed by the scriptures, just as the Kāmya Agnihotra (which is a rite with material ends) depends on such conditions as the morning and evening, because it is enjoined by the scriptures.

एवम् तद्भोजनादिप्रवृत्तौ नियमवत्स्यादिति चेत् । न ; नियमस्य अक्रियात्वात् क्रियायाश्चाप्रयोजनकत्वात् नासौ ज्ञानस्यापवादकरः

Br.Up. 1.3.1 Bh.

Objection: As the inclination to eat etc. (although due to defects) is regulated by the scriptures, so the restrictions about that Agnihotra too may apply to the sage.

Reply: No, for restrictions are not action, nor are they motivations to action. Hence, they are not obstacles to the attainment of knowledge (even by an aspirant).

'भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्तिऽ इत्येषणां ग्राहयन्ती श्रुतिः स्वयमेव बाधत इति चेत् – अथापि स्यादेषणाभ्यो व्युत्थानं विधाय पुनरेषणैकदेशं भिक्षाचर्यं ग्राहयन्ती तत्सम्बद्धमन्यदपि ग्राहयतीति चेत् । न, भिक्षाचर्यस्याप्रयोजकत्वात् – हुत्वोत्तरकालभक्षणवत् ; शेषप्रतिपत्तिकर्मत्वात् अप्रयोजकं हि तत् ; असंस्कारकत्वाच्च – भक्षणं पुरुषसंस्कारकमपि स्यात् , न तु भिक्षाचर्यम् नियमादृष्टस्यापि ब्रह्मविदः अनिष्टत्वात् । नियमादृष्टस्यानिष्टत्वे किं भिक्षाचर्येणेति चेत् । न, अन्यसाधनात् व्युत्थानस्य विहितत्वात् । तथापि किं तेनेति चेत् । यदि स्यात् , बाढम् अभ्युपगम्यते हि तत्

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

Objection: Does not the Śruti itself contradict this by teaching the adoption of desires in the words, '(The Brāhmaṇas) lead a mendicant life'? That is to say, after enjoining the renunciation of desires it teaches in the same breath the adoption of a part of them, viz. begging. Does this not imply the adoption of other connected things as well?

Reply: No, the begging does not imply other things as well, just as the drinking of the remnant (of Soma juice) after the oblation has been offered does not include any additional things; since it relates only to the disposal of what is left, it implies nothing else. Moreover, the begging has no purifying effect; the drinking of the juice might purify a person, but not the begging. Though there may be some merit in observing the rules regarding it, yet its application to the knower of Brahman is inadmissible.
Objection: If this is so, why should there be mention of his begging his food?
Reply: It is quite in order because the passage thereby enjoins the rejection of other means of subsistence.
Objection: Still what is the necessity for that?
Reply: None, if his realisation has reached that point of inaction; we accept that view.

Section 216

References:

'व्युत्थाय भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्तिऽ इत्यनेन पारिव्राज्यं विधीयते ; पारिव्राज्याश्रमे च यज्ञोपवीतादिसाधनानि विहितानि लिङ्गं च श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च ; अतः तत् वर्जयित्वा अन्यस्माद्व्युत्थानम् एषणात्वेऽपीति चेत् । न, विज्ञानसमानकर्तृकात्पारिव्राज्यात् एषणाव्युत्थानलक्षणात् पारिव्राज्यान्तरोपपत्तेः ; यद्धि तत् एषणाभ्यो व्युत्थानलक्षणं

पारिव्राज्यम् , तत् आत्मज्ञानाङ्गम् ,
आत्मज्ञानविरोध्येषणापरित्यागरूपत्वात् , अविद्याविषयत्वाच्चैषणायाः ;
तद्व्यतिरेकेण च अस्ति आश्रमरूपं पारिव्राज्यं
ब्रह्मलोकादिफलप्राप्तिसाधनम् , यद्विषयं यज्ञोपवीतादिसाधनविधानं
लिङ्गविधानं च । न च एषणारूपसाधनोपादानस्य आश्रमधर्ममात्रेण
पारिव्राज्यान्तरे विषये सम्भवति सति, सर्वोपनिषद्विहितस्य
आत्मज्ञानस्य बाधनं युक्तम् ,
यज्ञोपवीताद्यविद्याविषयैषणारूपसाधनोपादित्सायां च अवश्यम्
असाधनफलरूपस्य अशनायादिसंसारधर्मवर्जितस्य अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति
विज्ञानं बाध्यते । न च तद्बाधनं युक्तम् , सर्वोपनिषदां तदर्थपरत्वात्
Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

Objection: We admit that the passage, '(The Brāhmaṇas) renounce desires.... and lead a mendicant life,' enjoins monasticism. In this life, however, means such as the holy thread and certain insignia are enjoined by the Śrutis and Smṛtis. Therefore, the passage in question means that accessories other than these, although the latter are (auxiliaries of) desires, should be renounced.

Reply: Not so, for we know that there is another kind of monasticism different from this one. The latter relates to the same individual as Self-Knowledge and is characterised by the renunciation of desires. This monasticism is a part of Self-Knowledge because it is the renunciation of desires, which contradict Self-Knowledge and are within the province of ignorance. Besides this there is another kind of monasticism, which is an order of

life and leads to the attainment of the world of Hiraṇyagarbha and so on; it is about this that means such as the holy thread and particular insignia are enjoined. When there is this other kind of monasticism in which the adoption of means like the (auxiliaries of) desires is just a duty peculiar to that life, it is wrong to contradict Self-Knowledge that is enjoined by all the Upaniṣads. **If one is desirous of adopting means such as the sacred thread etc. which are the desires that belong to the plane of ignorance, then certainly it would contradict the knowledge such as, 'I am Brahman', which is neither the means nor end and is devoid of such transmigratory attributes as hunger. And it is not logical to contradict this knowledge, since it forms the objective of all the Upanishads.**

तन्नियमस्य पूर्वप्रवृत्तिसिद्धत्वात्तदतिक्रमे यत्नगौरवादर्थप्राप्तस्य व्युत्थानस्य पुनर्वचनाद्विदुषो मुमुक्षोः कर्तव्यत्वोपपत्तिः । अविदुषापि मुमुक्षुणा पारिव्राज्यं कर्तव्यमेव ; तथा च 'शान्तो दान्तः' (बृ। उ। ४ । ४ । २३) इत्यादिवचनं प्रमाणम् । शमदमादीनां चात्मदर्शनसाधनानामन्याश्रमेष्वनुपपत्तेः

Ait.Up. Upod. Bh.

since that restriction follows naturally out of past tendencies, and an overriding of them involves great effort. From the fact that a fresh injunction of renunciation, despite its emergence as a matter of course

(in the case of a man of illumination), is met with it becomes evident that it is obligatory for the man of illumination. And monasticism is obligatory even for the unillumined soul that hankers after liberation.
With regard to this matter the sentence, `Therefore he who knows thus becomes selfcontrolled, calm,' etc. (Br.Up. 4.4.23) can be cited as authoritative. Besides, such means for the realization of the Self as physical and mental control etc., are incompatible with other stages of life.

'निराशिषमनारम्भं निर्नमस्कारमस्तुतिम् । अक्षीणं क्षीणकर्माणं तं देवा ब्राह्मणं विदुःऽ (मो। ध। २६३ । ३४) इति सर्वकर्माभावं दर्शयति स्मृतिः विदुषः – 'विद्वांल्लिङ्गविवर्जितःऽ (?), 'तस्मादलिङ्गो धर्मज्ञःऽ (अश्व। ४६ । ५१) इति च । तस्मात् परमहंसपारिव्राज्यमेव व्युत्थानलक्षणं प्रतिपद्येत आत्मवित् सर्वकर्मसाधनपरित्यागरूपमिति

Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.

That the knower of Brahman has no work to do is shown by the following Smṛti passage, 'The gods consider him a knower of Brahman who has no desires, who undertakes no work, who does not salute or praise anybody, and whose work has been exhausted, but who himself is unchanged' (Mbh. XII. cclxix. 34). Also, 'The knower of Brahman wears no signs,' and 'Therefore the knower of religion (dharma), who wears no signs,' etc. (cf. Mbh. XIV. xlvi. 51).

Therefore, the knower of the Self should embrace that vow of the highest order of monks (paramahaṃsapārivrājyameva) which is characterised by the renunciation of desires and the abandonment of all work together with its means.

(Note: Hence those who are Mumukshus - whosoever they may be - must per force adopt this Paramahamsa Paarivraajya exclusively).

सर्वाणि कर्माणि सर्वकर्माणि संन्यस्य परित्यज्य नित्यं नैमित्तिकं काम्यं प्रतिषिद्धं च तानि सर्वाणि कर्माणि मनसा विवेकबुद्ध्या, कर्मादौ अकर्मसन्दर्शनेन सन्त्यज्येत्यर्थः, आस्ते तिष्ठति सुखम् । त्यक्तवाङ्मनःकायचेष्टः निरायासः प्रसन्नचित्तः आत्मनः अन्यत्र निवृत्तसर्वबाह्यप्रयोजनः इति 'सुखम् आस्तेऽ इत्युच्यते । वशी जितेन्द्रिय इत्यर्थः

BGh. 5.13

Actions are either the obligatory duties (nityakarmani), or those arising on the occurrence of some special events (naimittikakarmani), or those intended for securing some special ends, and which are only optional (kamyakarmani), or those which are forbidden (pratishiddhakarmani). The man who has subdued the senses, renounces all actions in speech, thought, and deed, by discrimination, by seeing inaction in action, and rests happily. He rests happily because he has given up all action in speech, thought and deed, because he is without worry, because his mind is calm, because,

excepting the Self, all interests (foreign to the Self) have departed from his mind.

यद्यपि कार्यकरणकर्माणि अविद्यया आत्मनि अध्यारोपितानि 'संन्यस्यास्तेऽ इत्युक्तम् , तथापि आत्मसमवायि तु कर्तृत्वं कारयितृत्वं च स्यात् इति आशङ्क्य आह । नैव कुर्वन् स्वयम् , न च कार्यकरणानि कारयन् क्रियासु प्रवर्तयन्

BGh. 5.13

Objection: It is true that he renounces the actions of the body and of the senses attributed falsely to the Self through ignorance; still, the power of acting and of causing to act may be inhere it, the Self and may remain in him who has renounced actions.

Answer: The Lord says: He neither acts himself, nor causes the body and the senses to act.

Section 217

References:

योऽयं लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः स उत्पन्नविवेकज्ञानस्य स्थितप्रज्ञस्य अविद्याकार्यत्वात् अविद्यानिवृत्तौ निवर्तते, अविद्यायाश्च विद्याविरोधात् निवृत्ति

BGh. 2.69

In the case of the man who possesses discriminative knowledge and whose knowledge has become steady, his experience of all matters, temporal and spiritual (laukika

and vaidika), ceases on the cessation of ignorance (avidya); for it is the effect of ignorance; and ignorance because it is opposed to knowledge.

ज्ञानविज्ञानतृप्तात्मा कूटस्थो विजितेन्द्रियः ।
युक्त इत्युच्यते योगी समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ॥
BG. 6.8 (smriti)
Whose mind is content with one's knowledge and its assimilation; who remains unchanged (kūṭastha); whose senses are mastered; for whom a lump of clay, a stone, and gold are (transcended as the reality, sat, that is) the same (sama) (otherwise, they are all seen as anartha, nothing to do for my security) – that yogī is called composed (yukta).

तस्मात् अक्षरोपासकानां सम्यग्दर्शननिष्ठानां संन्यासिनां त्यक्तसर्वैषणानाम् 'अद्वेष्टा सर्वभूतानाम्ऽ इत्यादिधर्मपूगं साक्षात् अमृतत्वकारणं वक्ष्यामीति प्रवर्तते
BGh. 12.12
Therefore, the Lord begins to set forth the group of characteristics which directly immortalizes the worshippers of the Imperishable who have secured right perception (understanding) and who have renounced all desires.

यो ह्य् आदित एव संन्यस्य कर्माणि ज्ञान-योग-निष्ठायां प्रवृत्तो यश् च कर्म-योगेन तयोः स्थित-प्रज्ञस्य 'प्रजहाति' इत्य् (ब्ग्। २।५५) आरभ्य अध्याय-परिसमाप्तिर् पर्यन्तं (स्थित-प्रज्ञ-)लक्षणं साधनं चोपदिश्यते ।

सर्वत्रैव हय् अध्य्-आत्म-शास्त्रे कृतार्थ-लक्षणानि यानि तान्य् एव साधनान्य् उपदिश्यन्ते यत्न-साध्यत्वात्। यानि यत्न-साध्यानि साधनानि लक्षणानि (च) भवति तानि - प्रजहातीति

BGh. 2.54

In the verses beginning from, 'When one fully renounces...', and ending with the completion the chapter, instruction about the characteristics of the man of steady wisdom and the disciplines (he had to pass through) is being given both for the one who has, indeed, applied himself to steadfastness in the Yoga of Knowledge after having renounced rites and duties from the very beginning [Even while he is in the stage of celibacy.], and for the one who has (applied himself to this after having passed) through the path of Karma-yoga. For in all the scriptures without exception, dealing, with spirituality, whatever are the characteristics of the man of realization are themselves presented as the disciplines for an aspirant, because these (characteristics) are the result of effort. And those that are the disciplines requiring effort, they become the characteristics (of the man of realization).

तस्मात् इदं धर्म्यामृतं मुमुक्षुणा यत्नतः अनुष्ठेयं विष्णोः प्रियं परं धाम जिगमिषुणा इति वाक्यार्थः

BGh. 12.20

therefore, this nectar which is indistinguishable from the virtues has to be diligently sought for by one who is a

seeker of Liberation, who wants to attain the coveted Abode of Viṣṇu. This is the purport of the sentence.

'उदासीनवत्ऽ (भ। गी। १४ । २३) इत्यादि 'गुणातीतः स उच्यतेऽ (भ। गी। १४ । २५) इत्येतदन्तम् उक्तं यावत् यत्नसाध्यं तावत् संन्यासिनः अनुष्ठेयं गुणातीतत्वसाधनं मुमुक्षोः ; स्थिरीभूतं तु स्वसंवेद्यं सत् गुणातीतस्य यतेः लक्षणं भवति इत्

BGh. 14.25

Everything that is described in (the) slokas beginning from "Like one unconcerned" (Gita 14.23) down to "He is said to have risen above gunas" (Gita 14.25), being a means to rise above the gunas, a sannyasi desiring moksha should try to achieve until such time as an effort is possible. And when he is established in it, all that becomes the characteristics by which the sannyasi who has risen above the modes (gunas) can be known.

Section 218

References:

अशरीरस्वभावस्य आत्मनः तदेवाहं शरीरं शरीरमेव च अहम् – इत्यविवेकादात्मभावः सशरीरत्वम्

Chand.Up. 8.12.1 Bh.

That fact of the Self of the nature of bodilessness becoming embodied consists in Its identification with the

body through the nondiscrimination such as, 'I indeed am the body, and the body indeed is myself'.

यत्तु गृहस्थेषु ब्रह्मविद्यासम्प्रदायकर्तृत्वादि लिङ्गं न तत्स्थितं न्यायं बाधितुमुत्सहते ; न हि विधिशतेनापि तमःप्रकाशयोरेकत्र सद्भावः शक्यते कर्तुम् , किमुत लिङ्गैः केवलैरिति

Mund.Up.Upod Bh.

The indication that there are some householders from whom originated the lineage of the knowers of Brahman (which fact is suggestive of the co-existence of knowledge and karma) does not affect the standing rule, **for not even by a hundred injunctions is it possible to make darkness and light co-exist**. What could then be done by mere indications?

यत्तूक्तम् - आचारदर्शनात् कर्मशेषो विद्येति । अत्र ब्रूमः - तुल्यम् आचार-दर्शनम् अकर्मशेषत्वेऽपि विद्यायाः । तथा हि श्रुतिर्भवति - 'एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुरृषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे'

'एतद्ध स्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसोऽग्निहोत्रं न जुहवाञ्चक्रिरे

'एतं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणाः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति' (ब्र।उप्। ३।५।१) इत्येवंजातीयका ।

याज्ञवल्क्यादीनामपि ब्रह्मविदाम् अकर्मनिष्ठत्वं दृश्यते - 'एतावदरे खल्वमृतत्वमिति होक्त्वा याज्ञवल्क्यः 'प्रवव्राज' (ब्र्।उप्। ४।५।१५) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः

BSBh. 3.4.9

With respect to the view (of the opponent of Vedānta), that because, (in the case of those who have attained the knowledge of Brahman) conduct of life as declared by the scriptures is seen i.e., they are seen to perform religious acts, therefore, knowledge is subservient to religious action.

Reply: (We say) that scriptural declarations about such conduct of life, are equally in support of the view that knowledge is not subservient to religious action. To that very effect is the scriptural declaration – "The sage Kāvaṣeya (the son of Kavaṣā) who had understood that (i.e. Brahman), said, why need I study the Vedas and why need I perform sacrifices?

"The ancient sages who had understood that (i.e. Brahman) never performed the Agnihotra".

"Knowing this Self (i.e. Brahman) the Brāhmaṇas, having discarded their innate desire for progeny (sons), wealth and the (acquisition of the) worlds, thereafter lead a life of mendicancy" (Br.Up. 3.5.1). It is to be seen (from the scriptures) that Yājñavalkya and others who had realized Brahman did not bank on religious actions (such as sacrifices etc.), thus – "He (Yājña-valkya) having said (to

his wife Maitreyī), 'My dear, verily that much (i.e. the knowledge that the Ātmā is the only one reality), is the means of immortality' renounced the world (and became a Sannyāsin)" (Br.Up. 4.5.15).

सम्भवति च सोपाधिकायां ब्रह्मविद्यायां कर्मसाहित्य-दर्शनम्
BSBh. 3.4.9
Now, it is possible that in the case of a Vidyā dealing with qualified Brahman i.e. Brahman under the influence of limiting adjuncts, knowledge and religious actions may well go together.

यथा च वर्तमाना ब्रह्मविदः । आरब्धभोगक्षये कैवल्यमनुभवन्ति - 'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ सम्पत्स्ये' (छन्।उप्। ६।१४।२) इति श्रुतेः - एवम् अपान्तरतमः-प्रभृतयोऽपीश्वराः परमेश्वरेण तेषु तेष्वधिकारेषु नियुक्ताः सन्तः । सत्यपि सम्यग्दर्शने कैवल्यहेतौ । अक्षीण-कर्मणो यावदधिकारम् अवतिष्ठन्ते । तदवसाने च अपवृज्यन्त इत्यविरुद्धम् । सकृत्प्रवृत्तमेव हि ते फलदानाय कर्माशयम् अतिवाहयन्तः । स्वातन्त्र्येणैव गृहादिव गृहान्तरम् अन्यमन्यं देहं सञ्चरन्तः स्वाधिकार-निर्वर्तनाय । अपरिमुषित-स्मृतय एव देहेन्द्रियप्रकृति-वशित्वात् निर्माय देहान् युगपत् क्रमेण वा अधितिष्ठन्ति
BSBh. 3.3.32
Or just as, some people of the present time who have realized Brahman, experience liberation, after the enjoyment of the fruits of their actions which have started fruition is exhausted, because the scriptures have

declared – “He is delayed only until he is relieved of his body and then he attains liberation” (Chan.Up. 6.14.2). That, Apāntaratama etc., Lords though they are and appointed though they are to their offices by the Highest Lord, and even though they possess correct i.e. perfect knowledge which is the means of liberation, have to continue in their bodies as long as their duty lasts, because their actions have not yet been exhausted. And that they obtain liberation when such actions get exhausted, is not contradictory. They (these Lords), while they are ridding themselves of the quantum of their actions which has once started fructifying, and migrating from one body to another, as from one house to another, with perfect liberty, and creating new bodies with the material of the body and sense-organs at their command, occupy such bodies, either simultaneously or successively, for the purpose of discharging the duties of their office. Although with the consciousness (of their having the nature of Brahman) unobliterated (not destroyed).

अतः ब्रह्मविदः जीवनादिप्रयोजनाभावेऽपि प्रवृत्तफलानां कर्मणामवश्यमेव फलोपभोगः स्यादिति । मुक्तेषुवत् तस्य तावदेव चिरमिति युक्तमेवोक्तमिति यथोक्तदोषचोदनानुपपत्तिः । ज्ञानोत्पत्तेरूर्ध्वं च ब्रह्मविदः कर्माभावमवोचाम ‘ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति’ (छा। उ। २ । २३ । १) इत्यत्र । तच्च स्मर्तुमर्हसि

Chand.Up. 6.14.2 Bh.

Hence, it is essential that a knower of Brahman will have to enjoy the results of actions that have become operative, even though there is no need (or no use) of his living etc (jīvanādiprayojanābhāve'pi). Hence also, as in the case of an arrow that is shot at a target, the declaration, ‘As for him the delay is only until such time’ is but logical, and therefore there is no reason for entertaining any doubt of the kind cited above. We have spoken earlier about the cessation of karma in respect of a knower of Brahman after the rise of knowledge. And here the instruction, ‘the one established in Brahman attains immortality’ (Chand.Up. 2.23.1) has to be borne in mind.

OM TAT SAT